DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 687 HE 002 455

TITLE	The Is and the Ought of Higher Education in the Seventies; Addresses and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western College Association.
INSTITUTION	Western Coll. Association, Oakland, Calif.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	62p.; Santa Barbara, March 11-12, 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, Evaluation, Federal Government, Financial Problems, Governance, *Higher Education, *Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Western College Association

ABSTRACT

The addresses presented at the annual meeting of the Western College Association and included in this volume are: the welcome by Vernon I. Cheadle; "The Continuing and Changing Federal Interest in Higher Education," by Peter P. Muirhead; "Education for Genuine Community in America," by Samuel D. Proctor; and "Higher Education in the Age of 'Future Shock'," by Mark H. Curtis. Also presented are reports of the three panel discussions on: (1) governing higher education; (2) funding higher education; and (3) evaluating higher education. The report concludes with the meeting's proceedings that include: the minutes of the business meeting; a report of the Chairman of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities; and a proposal for a study to identify the nature and variability of standards of academic performance. (AF)

Western College Association

ADDRESSES and PROCEEDINGS

The Is and the Ought of Higher Education in the Seventies

Annual Meeting

March 11-12, 1971

Biltmore Hotel

Santa Barbara

Addresses and Proceedings

ANNUAL MEETING 1971

WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION
MILLS COLLEGE
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94613
632-5000 Area Code 415

Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Kay J. Andersen

Table of Contents

Introduction

IT is difficult to decide which combination of factors determines the quality and character of an annual meeting. The physical setting, keynote speakers, panel discussions, and the mood of conferees and their campuses made the Santa Barbara gathering distinctive. In the midst of the usual conference conviviality, there was considerable ambivalence and limited optimism. Compared with last year, participants were feeling less student pressure but more intense financial and political discomfort. Most came to Santa Barbara to contribute, learn, and support one another in the year ahead, and, generally, these purposes were fulfilled.

Following a warm, thoughtful welcome by Chancellor Vernon Cheadle, University of California, Santa Barbara, major addresses were given by Peter P. Muirhead, Deputy Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Samuel D. Proctor, Professor of Education, Rutgers University; and Mark H. Curtis, President of the Western College Association and Scripps College. The theme was deliberately selected to stimulate a wide range of expressions about the present and future of higher education. A review of the addresses and panel discussions in this year's *Proceedings* will quickly dispel any notion that there is a shortage of ideas in this region, and yet the reader will find many of these ideas supported by concrete proposals.

To strengthen further the association of educators from California, Hawaii, and Guam, the WCA Constitution was amended to include as active members senior colleges and universities in Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. May this issue of the *Proceedings* serve to welcome those who choose to join the Western College community and to participate in the 1972 meeting in San Jose. Using the theme, "Expanded Access: Problems and Prospects," we will strive to appraise and give direction to some of the numerous developments in this field.

KAY J. ANDERSEN
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

VERNON I. CHEADLE
Chancellor
University of California,
Santa Barbara

Welcome

I KNOW you have had other greetings of one kind or another since you arrived here, but I am delighted to have the opportunity to give you my personal welcome to Santa Barbara. I am sure you have not failed to notice, too, that you are in an extraordinarily beautiful area, but I would like to mention that it is a stimulating place to be, too.

I think the presence of a university campus contributes a great deal to this environment and, because I am among my compatriots so to speak, I would like briefly to mention why.

This nation, indeed the entire world, is undergoing a dramatic change in its social order, and nowhere is the accompanying unrest more visible than on college and university campuses. This should not be surprising to anyone here. Of the nation's principal institutions, the colleges and universities provide the freest and most open climate for at least *talk* about change. As you know, apparently many persons unaccustomed to windy — and sometimes even relevant — discussions on campus think us liberal about their affairs and mighty conservative about ours.

Thus, from time to time, we must remind those not intimately acquainted with us that universities traditionally have been in the vanguard among critics of our society. In fact we have even achieved some changes in our own affairs while hopefully altering some fundamental precepts among the public at the same time. Indeed, those in higher education are pretty much engaged in such processes right now, even though we must fend off extremists of every kind while trying to make reasonable progress.

At UCSB, for example, we are struggling to re-examine our whole structure for the education of undergraduate students, with several objectives in mind:

We are, for example, trying to narrow the gap between undergraduate and graduate programs which developed as we were becoming a full-fledged general university campus.

We are, I think, also achieving improvements in the interaction between administration and student and between faculty and student. This should bring about greater participation among all members of the learning community in decisions affecting their lives. Just how to manage the proper degree of input among all segments is a never-ending controversy.

I think we are on the way toward diversification of available educational programs, and the creation of new ones, to the end that we may accommodate more effectively the great variety of student goals, interests, and abilities.

The pathway to meaningful modification is full of pitfalls. What is the appropriate division of authority among students, faculty, and staff? How

do we encourage experimentation with courses, and at the same time maintain strict accountability for what happens in them? What is a valid part of our tradition and what is simply "old?" What criteria should be used to respond to students' too-frequent appeals for "relevance?"

And how do we retain credibility with the "amazing maze" of diverse publics we are supposed to serve when our attempts to undergo effective change often dissolve into shouting matches or even worse disorders?

That maze, incidentally, consists of a highly politicized society — taxpayers of the extreme right and left, students of many political extremes and those in the middle, not to mention faculty members whose views range across the entire political spectrum. And each of these segments, naturally, is solely blessed with the revealed word.

And many of these components are very vocal. It has been our experience that the extremists on either side are perfectly capable of making outrageous and irresponsible accusations or statements about the institution. You don't need to know anything, just make the biggest and most phony outcry — that will get visibility. But when our sense of integrity requires that we respond with the truth, so far as we can ascertain it, it takes an enormous amount of time, and hence notable delays occur. Small wonder that it may appear that we are operating in confusion.

With all the internal problems we have these days, we still must find enough mobility to maintain proper relationships with local, county, state, and federal governments, and the many agencies of each level of government. Our involvement in Isla Vista (the predominantly student community adjacent to our campus that you haven't heard anything about, I'm sure) is a case in point.

We are in contradictory positions in our relationships there. We note citizens decrying the lack of University attention in Isla Vista (and some even who blame us for all the problems that have arisen there), and others decrying too much intrusion by the University. And you can be sure that we have had a great deal of advice about just what our position should be and also how we should maintain it. Advice has come from the federal, state, and local levels, and within the University, too. Some of the advice has been very valuable and often reassuring, because it supports some decisions we already had made about Isla Vista-UCSB relationships and what they ought to be. Some of the advice — as you might surmise — only illuminates the ignorance or naiveté of the giver.

May I gently remind you, too, that in any discussion of proper relationships with our various publics and governments, we must remember that money to maintain the University's basic teaching function comes primarily from the State government. This means that the State government has a powerful effect on the University and the potential for the University's welfare to become entangled in political considerations is great.

The University of California is facing a budgetary crisis at this moment, and yet, if we attempt to reverse the downward trend in State support, we run the risk of being accused of wasting time and money attacking some politician or another, or even the public itself — and not rendering enough of the remaining fat.

Nevertheless, as perilous as the tight ropes stretching all these diverse

points may seem, I am convinced that we must rely on meaningful, authentic communications as our means of repairing our rapport with the great public. We could not survive long if we were to become another political action agency. How to respond to the people and the problems around us without being trapped by inner and outer forces into becoming such an agency will tax our ingenuity and intelligence. I am not complaining about that — rather, I am trying to say that is one of the reasons why a university campus is a stimulating place to be.

Welcome to our countryside. And come out to the campus — we think it beautiful and, in its own way, very exhilarating.

PETER P. MUIRHEAD*
Deputy Commissioner of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

The Continuing and Changing Federal Interest in Higher Education

THANK you for this chance to be with you this afternoon. I am especially pleased because it comes at a time when the Administration has advanced a new, far-reaching program designed to assure, for the first time in history, equal postsecondary educational opportunity for *all* our young people. This goal, I know, is as dear to your heart as it is to mine.

Before we explore how this and other needed, dramatic higher education reforms and improvements are to be attained, I think it would be worthwhile to look back for a moment, to view and assess how far higher education has come in the historically brief time span since the new federal interest in higher education manifested itself with enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958.

As Al Smith was wont to say, "Let's look at the record."

What the record shows, first and foremost, is that higher education found leadership, resources, and vitality more than to double a three and a half million student enrollment in the decade of the 1960's — no mean accomplishment. For in that ten-year span we managed more than to equal the student growth of the previous three centuries — from the day John Harvard launched it all at Cambridge with 780 pounds sterling and 320 books.

Remarkable as this capacity to absorb students has been, it is anything but the total story of the achievements of higher education during the last decade. What we have also witnessed is the ability of our colleges and universities to exhibit greater maturity and a deeper sense of social responsibility and a broadened concern on the part of teachers and students alike about the relevance of subject matter. At the same time we have seen the capacity of our institutions to accommodate, albeit in some cases with a not-surprising hesitation, the inelegant but nonetheless effective importunities of student dissent, due in some degree to our pre-occupation with traditional ways of responding to problems and, in part, to our failure to recognize fully the mood for change and the need for innovation.

However, I believe it has been a period when for the first time America became fully conscious of the potentialities of higher education as the key to the future, not simply the future of the well-to-do, but the future of all — the rich, the poor, the black, the white, the young, and the old. As sources of knowledge, as laboratories of research, as centers of strength for aiding in the solution of problems crucial to our national existence, our colleges and universities became of central importance to all that truly matters to most people — their health, welfare, and general

*In the absence of Mr. Muirhead, his speech was delivered by Paul F. Lawrence, Regional Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education, San Francisco.

ability to deal with challenging, complex, and often puzzling lives we find ourselves living in the latter third of the 20th century.

Higher education has lifted the nation to a level of academic competence unprecedented in history, yet all too many capable young people have been frustrated in their desire to participate in the learning explosion through no fault of their own. Clearly, we cannot afford to allow statistics of growth to obscure the pressing need for extension of opportunity for higher education, particularly to segments of the population that have been traditionally left behind.

Higher education has helped enrich the country. Some studies suggest that more than one-fifth of our economic growth during the last three or four decades is attributable to increases in the average educational attainment of our labor force, with perhaps another fifth based on the general advance in knowledge. Edward Dennison of the Brookings Institutions has found that of every five dollars of additional personal income attained during the 1960's, one dollar is explained by higher levels of educational attainment.

As higher education came to grips with serving more and more of our people, it quite reasonably experienced a noteworthy expansion in expenditures. While spending money may not universally be regarded as an accomplishment, during the past dozen years higher education has learned to deal with levels of funding commensurate with its importance. The portion of the Gross National Product consumed by institutions of higher education has doubled in this period, climbing to two per cent from the one per cent that had been standard for nearly 30 years. And most of the studies and projections I have seen indicate that it will require three per cent of the GNP to keep education healthy by the time the nation is 200 years old, five years from now.

In looking at the facts of growth, expansion, and change, we must not lose sight of how the lives of individual young people have been enriched by the commitment of our institutions to their betterment. The steadily escalating aspiration of parents and of needs of their children — coupled with a heightened perception of the direct bearing of the quality of higher education on the fortunes of the nation at large — underlies a profound development of the recent past that I have had the opportunity to observe in some detail: the evolution of the federal role in support of higher education.

My first job with the Office of Education more than a dozen years ago was to help administer the NDEA Act of 1958, the first of the great laws passed in response to the general demand that the federal government accept a larger part of the financial burden of expanding and improving our system of higher education. The relationship between the federal government and higher education has resulted, it seems to me, in a period of remarkable progress.

Science has flowered; millions of men and women, particularly returning GI's, have got a college education (and paid the government back, I should add, many times over by virtue of taxes on their increased incomes); classrooms, dormitories, student unions, laboratories, and other facilities have mushroomed on campuses across the country; and bureaucratic con-

versation has acquired a new fascination for academic types. Clark Kerr may have put his finger on it when he observed that $4.6 billion a year can make a great deal of difference.

Of course, it has taken a while to build the federal share up to that level. Prior to 1958 the federal interest in higher education was mostly limited to such enterprises as the land-grant college legislation, the GI Bills, and the purchase of research and services in the hard sciences by the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and the National Institutes of Health. There were grants — totaling a few million dollars a year—to institutions conducting cooperative research. But, on the whole, federal support of higher education *per se* was both minor and narrow, in a sense antiseptic, and chiefly reflective of the federal government's own interests rather than the interests of the institutions themselves.

NOW, this type of support is important, serves worthwhile purposes and certainly will be continued but the federal policy, initiated with NDEA in 1958 and refined and expanded with passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, is a horse of quite a different color. The pattern that has emerged is one that does not submerge higher education's priorities under federal priorities, but rather recognizes the importance of higher education to the overall progress of society, and, of equal importance, responds to the aspirations of young people and their parents.

President Nixon, in laying before the Congress the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971 and the proposal for the creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education, has moved boldly to build on the pattern of federal assistance to meet felt needs of students and at the same time to provide a new vehicle to enable higher education to carry out the reforms and innovations needed to expand their ability to cope with the realities that increased enrollments and technological change will continue to produce.

At the very heart of what the student aid programs under the Higher Education Opportunity Act are all about stands the President's unfettered assertion: "No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money."

Under four major programs currently administered by the Office, Equal Education Opportunity Grants, the College Work-Study program, National Defense Student Loans, and Guaranteed Loans, a million and a half students are receiving benefits. The President's proposal would make available funds to assist another million students through expansion of the ongoing programs and creation of a National Student Loan Association. In fiscal 1972, approximately $575 million in grants and work-study payments would be available, an increase of $242 million above fiscal 1971. Interest subsidies under the proposed National Student Loan Agency would increase NDEA type loans to $1.2 billion, an $830 million increase over the current fiscal year ending June 30th.

The $1 billion-plus assistance package would go a long way toward ending the situation in which a young person whose family earns more

than $15,000 a year is almost five times more likely to attend college than a young person whose family earns less than $3,000. It would also end an imbalance that sees a black student's chance of entering college only half that of a white student. If anyone doubts that nonwhites are strongly oriented toward college as means of upward social mobility, a look at surveys, indicating that a higher proportion of nonwhite than white seniors plan to enter college, would bury that bit of social mythology.

While the present system of student assistance is helping a million and a half students, there are indeed special problems inherent in the system. First, for instance, students do not receive all the aid for which they are eligible since allocation formulas, matching requirements, and insufficient funds limit the aid that institutions can award to individual students. Colleges and universities enrolling large numbers of disadvantaged students are in an especially difficult position because of the matching requirement.

Secondly, existing loans programs provide an inadequate volume of loanable funds because the National Defense Loan program requires capital outlays from the federal budget which have been under severe fiscal pressures and restraints for the last several years. Also, students must compete with other borrowers — many of whom offer more profitable investment opportunities — for the lendable funds of banks under the Guaranteed Loan program.

Finally, a student who wants to go to college cannot tell where he can get aid or how much he can count on in advance of his admission and the particular student aid office determination, and a bank cannot assure the student in advance that it will have funds to lend him.

The new and expanded assistance program faces up to deficiences in the current system in the following ways:

One. The National Student Loan Agency, serving as a private corporation chartered and established by the federal government, would increase the amount of resources available for loans (both subsidized and unsubsidized) to all students at all income levels. It would raise funds by issuing its own obligations for sale in private capital markets. These obligations would be guaranteed against default by the government. Typically, a college without funds of its own to invest in student loans would make a loan to a student and then turn immediately to the National Student Loan Agency to sell the student's note. The National Student Loan Agency would pay enough for the note to restore the college's cash position. Both colleges and banks would be encouraged to do more student lending. It is estimated that the National Student Loan Agency may buy up to $2 billion worth of loans in its first year.

Two. The $242 million expansion in grants and work-study payments will be coupled with a discontinuation of matching requirements under the program of Educational Opportunity Grants. A student whose family income is $10,000 or less could receive an aid package consisting of $1,400, of which $1,000 would be in the form of grants and work-study and a possible $400 in subsidized loans. In addition to these basic amounts, students who meet eligibility requirements for subsidized aid and attend school with an average annual cost in excess of $1,400 would be eligible

to apply for an additional subsidized "cost of education" loan of up to $1,500. This program would be controlled by the schools in a manner similar to the present NDEA loan programs and terms to students would be approximately the same as those governing present NDEA loans.

Three. Each year the Secretary of HEW, after conferring with the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students, would publish a schedule indicating the amount of federal funds available to students at different income levels. Each student's eligibility would be calculated by determining the expected family contribution toward his educational costs. This determination to be made by the college financial aid offices would take into account such factors as the size of the family, the number of children in college, extraordinary family expense, and capital assets. The deficiency between expected family contribution and the amount of resources the student should have available to him would be met by a combination of grants, work-study payments, and subsidized loans.

The broader and liberalized student-aid proposals encompassed in the Higher Education Opportunities Act represent but one Title — Title IV—the overall legislative package for higher education aimed at improving and expanding the federal commitment to our colleges and universities and their students. Another Title of the proposed new law, which would be of special interest to you is Title VIII, which extends the Higher Education Facilities Act through 1976. In addition, it adds a new program of federal insurance of loans for the construction of academic facilities at private nonprofit institutions of higher education. Loans may be made either to the institutions or to nonprofit private higher education building agencies.

The proposed National Foundation for Higher Education, which would focus its efforts on the financing of reform and innovation in post-secondary education, represents yet another aspect of the administration's determination to seek solutions to pressing higher education problems. "The time has come," the President noted, "for the federal government to help academic communities to pursue excellence and reform in fields of their own choosing . . ." A total of $100 million would be made available by the proposed Foundation in the fiscal year 1972.

Funds could be utilized for:

— providing assistance for the design and establishment of innovative structures and teaching methods in higher education;

— expanding the methods and patterns of acquiring higher education and opening opportunities for such education to individuals of all ages and circumstances;

— strengthening the autonomy, individuality, and sense of mission of postsecondary educational institutions, and supporting programs that are distinctive or of special value to American society; and

— encouraging postsecondary educational institutions to develop policies, programs, and practices which are responsive to social needs, and by providing an organization in the federal government that is concerned with the rationalization of public policy toward higher education.

The Foundation would also direct special efforts toward meeting the needs of black institutions. I think I should also point out that the proposed

reform of student aid programs, with its concentration of funds on the neediest students, would significantly aid students of black institutions. Further, additional funds for black colleges have been requested for fiscal year 1972 in programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These projects add up to a special concern for enhancing the quantity and quality of education for young black Americans.

Significant and far-reaching as the Foundation proposal and the Higher Education Opportunities Act are, they do not address the problem of institutional aid.

A recent study of the financial plight of private institutions by the Association of American Colleges glumly concluded: "Private colleges and universities are apprehensive and they have reason to be. Most colleges in the red are staying in the red and many are getting redder, while colleges in the black are generally growing grayer. Taken collectively they will not long be able to serve higher education and the nation with strength unless significant aid is soon forthcoming."

In another study of private and public institutions titled "The New Depression in Higher Education," Earl F. Cheit points out that, although the public institutions have not yet been hurt as much as the private ones, "One thing all schools have in common is that they are likely to be in trouble if present trends continue."

These studies and reports are all part of the symphony of agreement among the institutions of higher education that federal institutional assistance is desirable and necessary, but there is a cacophony of conflicting views as to precisely what form the institutional aid should take.

The problem, and it is a difficult one, originates in the tremendous diversity of our system of higher education — with large institutions and small ones, single-purpose and multi-purpose, church-related and independent, private and public. Devising a system of equitable assistance for such a multi-faceted enterprise is not easy, but ultimately it must be accomplished. It must be accomplished if we are indeed serious about providing equal educational opportunity for a quality education for all our youth and preventing the escalating costs of higher education from making this a cruel and elusive promise for all too many. Perhaps the greatest of these opportunities is the mandate of the American people for equal educational opportunity and for higher education to go as far and as fast in the service of society as its ambitions and leadership will take it.

This is what it all comes down to in the end — the continuing, increasingly difficult, but absolutely essential opportunity and service that higher education must render to youth and to society if the hopes of our civilization are to be achieved. American higher education has given us much, and this cannot de disputed. That it must provide much more is equally indisputable.

As we look back over our accomplishments, there is major ground for optimism and satisfaction. It is simply the fact that all the landmark pieces of federal legislation enacted have been endorsed by lawmakers on both sides of the political aisle. The fact that this consensus transcends

party affiliations and that the executive and legislative branches have and are continuing to support the concepts of equal educational opportunities augurs well for the future of the federal interest in higher education.

We have every reason, I firmly believe, for taking pride in past achievements and for taking heart in the certainty of our ability to meet tomorrow's challenges.

SAMUEL D. PROCTOR
Professor of Education
Rutgers University

*Education for Genuine Community in America

IT IS a tough assignment to ask education to undertake the task of building a genuine sense of community in America. It is a task that needs urgent attention, but is education ready or able? We have completed our geographic community. We are spread from sea to shining sea. We are ringing our old cities with satellite communities and we are bold about building anything anywhere. Jet planes and television have us stumbling over each other and regional speech habits are less and less identifiable. We see signs of the making of a national community, but genuine community means more than wearing the same clothes, eating the same food, singing the same songs or using the same language. It is much more profound. It deals in attitudes toward the defenseless, the use or misuse of natural resources, how a stranger feels in our midst, and what hope is there for a late entrant in the race to success. A society may have physical community thrust upon it, but genuine community is a human achievement.

Moreover the polarization in our country is hardening. The cynicism of many of the young is growing. The leadership from high government is ambiguous at best and fatalistic at worst.

The young who are so critical of our institutions have no mutual basis for conversation with adult leadership, for they have rejected the starting points of discussion that the adult generation takes for granted, namely: the Judaeo-Christian ethical norms and free enterprise. They declare that our conduct has made such a mockery of ethics that we have lost credibility and that the free enterprise system has failed to cure poverty or to keep an economy stable without a war every generation. So, on two very important counts the conversation ceases.

The black population is no longer content with a slow trickle of favored and talented ones in their midst escalating to positions of privilege while their masses are caught in a spiral of poverty, ignorance, and futility.

But even apart from the question of the generation gap and the racial gap, the country has a deeper chasm to bridge. We are divided between those who, on the one hand, feel that America is big enough, strong enough, and responsible enough to invest its resources on a generous scale to humanize life for her masses at home and to share far more

*This is the text which Dr. Proctor had before him when he spoke, but it bears little resemblance to the talk he actually gave.

freely her resources abroad, and, on the other hand, those who are postured in the opposite direction. The latter feel that it is not the business of anyone to establish a floor on poverty and want. They cannot conceive of people in America not getting what they deserve. They have no awareness of social processes that compound injustice or of the unfair distribution of advantages. They see everything as earned and they are blind to their inherited status that may be a fortunate one, and that of another that may be unfortunate.

This condition did not suddenly descend upon us like a solar eclipse. We have been moving toward it for a long time. It is more visible today because those who have been estranged, alienated, and insulated have become more and more vocal. They will not become less vocal. Their aspirations will not recede. The forces are solid and real that have raised the expectations of the disinherited. They have made people aware of their tangential status in our society. And this awareness is no illusion.

We need help. We need to find out how to succeed in laying the foundation for building genuine community in America. This need is more important than faster trains, bigger planes, better surgery, cleaner water and purer air. We could press our technology to a fine perfection, work out the rhythm of the economy, clean up the environment and add years to our lives, but with this technology and in this sanitized environment we could stumble and blunder into one conflict after another until our only option left would be as barbarous as those of cave men and as primitive as the anthropoids. We need help.

The term "genuine community" is used to suggest that there are superficial levels of community that are fairly easily attainable. Men who are accidentally thrown together by the force of circumstance, with no choice on their part, share only physical proximity. This does not involve the height and depth of the human spirit. It calls for politeness and civility, but it does not call into motion the more profound aspects of our human capacities. Men who happen to share the same airport limousine from the loading ramp to the hotel lobby may be said to be in community. But this is for one hour and with a very limited objective. Athletes who take to the field, wearing the same uniform and prepared to risk injury for victory, are indeed in community. But again, this is for a limited time span and for a very limited objective. Even a family, sharing a common genetic and biological heritage, whose voices have a similar timbre, whose members walk with the same gait and whose youth is spent by the same fireside, share a great deal in common. But unless they choose to live by a common set of values, unless their sense of charity exceeds their competing ambitions and unless their blood kinship is superceded by a moral kinship, their community is strained and tenuous. Luckily, for some families, even though they inherited each other, they do eventually choose the fellowship of each other, and their family ties are interwoven with the strongest human ties, and community is created.

Genuine community has to do with a long time span. Its duration is limited by choice not by other arbitrary constraints. It arises out of

volition, not circumstance. It means that the freedom to deny fellowship is a real freedom and with this freedom men choose rapprochement rather than estrangement. This is genuine community. It involves us not at surface levels of concern alone, but in genuine community the total life is involved, and every facet of the prism of human emotion is reflected from one side to another.

Genuine community may be difficult to describe, but its absence is easily recognizable. Everyone can tell when he is being tolerated. Everyone knows when solitude is better than false fellowship. Everyone knows when clear limits to his participation have been set and when most of his personhood is being denied.

The achievement of a genuine sense of community will not be easy. As John Gardner says, it is more fun to hate than to love. It seems to be so much easier to stand body deep in our own racial and economic circles with our backs turned to the world and sing our chauvinistic songs to one another.

Moreover, the culture is loaded with symbols that tell us who people are, who should be in and who should be out, who should be sponsored and who should be rejected. We have had so much experience, so much rehearsal in exclusion tactics, that we would have an awful lot of re-education to start building a strategy for inclusion. The advantaged groups and classes have the institutions of business and government so aligned in their favor that only the most discerning can tell where social grouping ends and institutional life begins. In other words, those who are left out are locked out and those who are in are in to stay.

It is only natural and fair to turn to education for leadership in this difficult time because we have spent millions of dollars developing a system that carries a student from age 5 to age 20 without significant cost to himself or his parents. Our tradition strives for objectivity and that truth which is born out of evidence. Furthermore, the system has a sort of unwritten commitment to distribute opportunity, to become the grand intervention in the life of a child whose social and economic legacy is weak.

So, when the society starts falling apart, it is understandable for us to focus our attention on education and its leaders to create a new momentum toward community.

Of course, we recognize that when we turn to education we are turning to an institution that derives its existence from the very society we want to heal. It is a product of the society and the umbilical cord cannot be cut. So, even though we hardly have any other agency for change with the potential of education, we recognize its limitations. It is a beholden thing!

Another limitation is that we have never been where genuine community would lead us. This would be a novel thing both in substance and in pursuit. We have had all sorts of goals for education, the growth of the whole child, academic excellence, citizenship participation and global awareness, but our times call for an added dimension. We want education to prepare us to live in a society of variety and make it work, to live among people with widely differing starting points and finding

joy in seeing them all moving forward at their optimum pace, to find happiness and fulfillment, not in power — in domination — in self-destructive greed or materialism, but in helping others to find value in their lives. We want education to define a new goal for us that is more satisfying than affluence, more humane than race and class strife, and more decent than self-indulgence.

The accent in our society has been on competition and success, and this success was seen as a mark of personal supremacy. This attitude is passed down through the system, and education is just a series of scratch lines for one heat after another.

This process is designed to select winners and losers. So many emphases are placed on winning and losing that one great fear stalks us all and we are taught to be self-regarding for the sake of winning. This self-regard enlarges to group-regard, class-regard. Our positions are jealously guarded and, instead of this fostering community, it fosters strife, competition, and subtle forms of preferentialism.

The culture is geared up for non-community, rather than community. We are far better trained to compete, to succeed, and to prevail than we are to cooperate, to inspire, and to support.

If, then, the man for the new age must be a participant in genuine community, what is reasonable and fair to ask of education? Given the limitations that we have acknowledged and the rigidities with which we must reckon, what options are open to school personnel that would make some real differences, feasible options and "do-able" options? What are some "for instances" that can be performed in human history and that do not require the heavens to divide and a new Jerusalem to descend?

Well, we can surely give our students a new introduction to the human family by broadening the scope of the humanities. When I was a boy in school I was left to believe that Timbuktu was a mythical place on the edge of wonderland. In 1962 I greeted four Peace Corps volunteers who had driven from Monrovia to Lagos passing through Timbuktu! It shook me!

We can include in our presentation of man's search for the good, the beautiful, the true, and the ultimate some answers that were arrived at by the Asians, the Latin Americans, the Africans, and the dwellers of the islands of the seven seas. We need a more balanced diet for the young, nurturing the notice that modern man belongs to a total human community that stretches far beyond the Mediterranean and the Atlantic cultures.

Our present offerings, with a very few exceptions, imply the subtle suggestion that civilization began in 1066 and all that went before was a prelude to William the Conqueror. The rest of the world lay in a shadow of stupidity and barbarism with a slight interruption by Socrates, Aristotle, and Cicero. After all, there was quite a highly developed Moslem culture in pre-colonial Africa and the pyramids were not built by idiots. Modern Japan does not rest on Western European antecedents, and the idea of ethical monotheism does antedate Shakespeare by a few thousand years.

What do you suppose students think when a course is listed as "Non-

Western Civilization"? It says that one should be prepared for a surprise! It is a very condescending view of people whose origins are other than European.

As technology gallops towards a shrinking world, bringing us all closer together, and as we suffer the consequences of ethnic and national isolation, the man for the new age must become acquainted with the human race in a positive and affirmative way in all of its variety.

It is true that the European continent may have been the extraordinary beneficiary of favorable climate and rainfall, a livable mean temperature and a safe distance from the Equator and the two poles. It is true that these factors invited Christianity, Egyptian mathematics, and Greek logic and language. It became the repository of three excellent cultural syntheses, Greek, Christian, and Roman. But this process needs to be made very clear and the existence of other cultures needs to be explained in terms of their environments too. One basis for community is this broad appreciation for all peoples doing their own thing with what they had.

As we turn to the social sciences the situation is not far different. The promise of August Compte that the social sciences in a positivistic framework would be neutral, objective, and unbiased has been lost to the cult of enumeration. The social sciences have been frightened into a safe discipline of counting things, describing events that have already happened, and cataloguing social groups that have already formed. The most sophisticated social science will dare to chart the trajectory of a movement that somehow has already been launched.

It is altogether too risky to look at the possibilities that the future may hold when it is so professionally safe to recount again and again what the past has shown. Social science deals in memorabilia. Whoever it was who said that history is the only true social science was right in practice but dead wrong in theory.

If Arthur Schlesinger was correct when he said history has seen more change in the last hundred years than in the previous thousand, then we can slow down on retrospection and concentrate on prognostication! Where are we going so fast? Whose business is it to tell us?

It is not enough to know how Jefferson, Adams, and Monroe put together our Constitutional democracy. We need to know how viable it is, how does it accommodate the power foci that have developed, how do we save it from economic manipulation, how do we protect its minorities, how does it save its citizens from a runaway technocracy, and how does it manage to share its prerogatives with the growing need for a world political community? The questions relate to the task of real community.

Moreover, if we are to prepare our young for genuine community, they need to know more than how the American economy advanced so fast. They need to examine its capacity to care for its victims at home and abroad. How compatible is a competitive free enterprise system with world hunger, with the self-determination of small and powerless nations from whom so much of our raw material is extracted? These are the questions that have college students so up-tight and the answers are slow.

It is beautiful to know how much of our freedom was explained away by Darwin, Marx, and Freud, but it would be even better to know how much is left! Should we be stranded believing that all that we can ever become is shared already by class struggle, by natural selection, and by glandular necessities? Who is going to show us that margin of freedom that remains? Who is going to show us how to transcend class struggle, how to impose human direction upon natural selection, and how to sublimate glandular demands to the requirements of total self-realization? To what discipline do these questions belong? These are the truly big questions and the answers are the new frontiers of education and the prerequisites for genuine community.

The people in charge of the natural sciences and mathematics want to exempt themselves and tip-toe out of the room when we get to such soft-headed topics as equalizing opportunity in education. They declare that there is no room for new entrances to their sacred chambers, and the old exits are still there.

This situation is so critical because these are the bread and butter subjects. Here is where jobs are found, and if economic change is to come it will require as a prime condition that the employables should be at home in a world of cause and effect and be able to make accurate predictions. And real community will not go far beyond the stage of sentiment and romanticism if it does not embrace the notion that people who have been deprived can be prepared for economic self-sufficiency.

Nothing shows so clearly the way in which education fails to support genuine community as the way in which math and science promote those who are not ready and intimidates those who are not ready. This process galvanizes the job categories and guarantees a population of those who cannot keep pace with technology.

THESE disciplines are the turf for middle class students, black, white, red brown and yellow. They have had plane rides, they have been taken to the zoo to do more than giggle at strange sights, they know how a garden grows, why birds migrate, and what the ice age had to do with the Grand Canyon. They are not frightened by big words, Greek and Latin derivatives that turn up in biology and geometry. They have been taught to approach nature and numbers with an audacious questioning attitude. There are no mysteries too sacred to probe. But those whose parents are less verbal and whose work discourages reflective thinking cannot prepare their children adequately for science and mathematics, for the cycle goes round and round. Their children are squeezed out of the competitive job market.

Thus far, we are not talking about native intelligence. We are talking only about life style and the adequacy or inadequacy of preparation to leap into the sciences on the run.

The challenge therefore is to produce some teachers who will be patient enough, vicarious enough, humble enough, and compassionate enough to learn the world and the experiences of the economically deprived, learn it well enough to walk around in it intellectually, and to discover how to use the jargon of that world, the thought coinage of that world,

the experiences of that world as a starting point for making the secrets of nature lay themselves bare.

The importance of this can be seen as we contemplate the continuation of the present process, children from tenant farms and from the urban ghetto spending twelve years in school and finding college a house of mirrors. When education becomes for them an intriguing and exciting experience, they will stick with it. They will be ready for the best jobs, they will make the leap out of the poverty syndrome and their children will have a different starting point in life. This is a basic condition to the building of genuine community in America.

We have seen education rise to majestic crescendos from time to time as the cadence of progress called for a new and larger effort. There will always be those who will want to see the staus quo protected because of their own interest, but they forget that the status quo was once new; it had to be striven for; it was once a very novel thing.

So, we are asking for novelty now, that the next generation may inherit a status quo different from ours and more nearly appropriate for the total man. It seems a long way off in view of today's newscasts and front pages.

But man is an incurable adventurer. The higher the mountain, the more eager he is to scale it. The wider and deeper the ocean, the more anxious he is to span it. The farther away the planet, the more he dreams of circling it. The more dreadful the disease, the more determined he is to conquer it. The more complex the problem, the more anxious he is to solve it. And with this spirit, nature, time, and space have been captured.

The task before us is to convert our mastery over things external to a mastery over our impulses, our prejudices, our loyalties, and our commitments that come from within. Our vision in the field of education must reach far beyond the development of skills in the cognitive areas, the organization and communication of facts and ideas. We need insight into those affective areas of learning where values are formed, where a definition of the person is evolved, and where working hypotheses about the human family are constantly under scrutiny.

It is in this area of endeavor that we consider the most serious question of all, how to prepare the young to accept the notion of genuine community and the challenge to spend a lifetime in its pursuit.

MARK H. CURTIS
President, Scripps College
President, Western College Association

Higher Education in the Age of "Future Schock"

THE speech you are about to hear is not the one I originally prepared for this occasion. The announcement made in Washington last Monday by the commission headed by Frank Newman of Stanford was the last of several events that made that speech irrelevant for this occasion. Instead of holding forth on the announced topic, I am going to address myself to the subject of higher education in the age of "future shock." I want to suggest that a tide of change is at the flood. If in the midst of the rush of events we and our institutions are not to be swept away, we must make certain we know in what direction our goals lie and how we can steer toward them.

As a prelude to what I have to say, I want to share with you my amazement at how fast a certain series of events has developed in recent months into a strong, almost irresistible, trend. Less than two years ago experts in educational planning were still making projections about rising enrollments, costs, and need for new physical facilities on the basis of the perpetuation, expansion, and replication of existing institutions and their basic four-year undergraduate programs. After the experts made their calculations and predictions, we administrators agonized over the results and occasionaly lost the usual sanguine disposition of educators as we contemplated a future holding out little promise but that of deepening deficits. In our moments of despair it seemed that the only rope by which we could pull ourselves from the bottomless pit was made of two strands: one, the beneficence of legislators and taxpayers, and the other, the blessings of technological aids to learning that just might prove less costly than professorial salaries. Also less than two years ago, I and the other members of the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education first approached the possibility of dealing with national or regional universities, founded to grant external degrees, almost as if it were an evil spirit which we wanted to exorcise.

These attitudes may still linger on, but they have been seriously and repeatedly challenged in the last six months. In October the Commission on Academic Affairs put on a program for the annual meeting of the American Council on Education based on the theme "Higher Education for Everybody?" Papers given there began to break down walls of preconceptions that had long imprisoned the thinking of educators. Then in November 1970 the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, and the National Commission on Accrediting began consultations on how to advise member institutions and organizations

concerning the issues and problems which would arise with the coming of agencies to grant external degrees. At about the same time the College Entrance Examination Board and the Educational Testing Service, supported by the Carnegie Corporation, set Samuel B. Gould and a special commission to work on the subject of non-traditional study. In line with these developments the winter issue of the *College Board Review* appeared with an article by Alan Pifer of the Carnegie Corporation entitled "Is It Time for an External Degree?" In January, hard upon the heels of this article came the most recent Kerr Commission report called *Less Time, More Options,* which, among other things, called for reduction in the time students need to spend in traditional programs and recommended experimentation with "open universities." Since January events have occurred with even greater rapidity. In mid-February the State University of New York and the New York Board of Regents, both receiving grants from the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, announced the establishments of two separate ways for earning external degrees. The Ford Foundation also gave funds to the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities to plan a "University Without Walls" and to Syracuse University to start a program to grant external baccalaureate degrees to students in five counties of New York State. Then to jump across the continent, Glenn Dumke on January 26, 1971, made a series of far-reaching proposals before the Committee on Educational Policy of the California State Colleges. He proposed several measures to reduce the time undergraduates spend in earning degrees, to devise new ways to reorganize the work of college faculties and to calculate their workloads, and to develop for the State College Extension Program degree-granting centers. Finally the Newman Commission of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare came out only this week with a set of recommendations which are as provocative and innovative as any of the other developments and which, being endorsed by Secretary Richardson, give the whole movement immeasurable support.

What we have seen, then, is an unprecedented confluence of almost all of the major forces and influences in higher education in America into one powerful surging current of innovation and change. It will gain irresistible force if it will in fact banish for us the spectre of uncontrollable mounting costs and instead save us, as the Kerr Commission report predicts, $3-5 billion a year in institutional operating expenses and $5 billion in construction costs in the decade of the 1970's.

It is no longer a question then, of *whether* "open universities," "universities without walls," external degrees, new types of degree programs, and new time schedules for individuals to pursue learning, especially for those in the category of non-traditional students, are going to come into existence, but rather a matter of a very different order: how fast will they spread — *like wildfire?* How soundly will they be developed — will the new external degrees like the old ones of the University of London "represent . . . the same standards of knowledge and attainments [as the internal degrees]"? How will their development affect the role of other colleges and universities; and how will they be accepted by our society which has depended on the traditional institutions and their

traditional programs to certify the qualifications of individuals to take positions of responsibility in business, industry, government, community life, and the professions? Let me comment on a few of these topics.

ONE of the major issues to be faced is how will new institutions and new programs be accredited. It is not enough to say that they will be accredited as part of the general accreditation of a college or university sponsoring or offering them. The old criteria for accreditation will probably not apply. A "university without walls," for instance, will probably not need a library, and it may not need elaborate laboratories. Its staff and faculty may be an administrator, a board of examiners, some counselors, and a few teacher-scholars to prepare lectures on audio-visual tape and publish course programs for individual study. Although an external degree program in an established and accredited institution like one of the California State Colleges may have more facilities and faculty than the unconventional institution, the policies and practices for conducting it will still be different enough to require different methods of evaluating it. An accreditation committee will have to find new means instead of those now used to examine and test the quality of programs. They may have to review the examinations given to determine the level of attainment required of a candidate for a degree. Perhaps they will appraise the competence of the board of examiners. If so, how will they do it? Will they also have to evaluate the procedures used for administering examinations? And what about counseling, will they have to investigate the kind of counseling students get to discover whether the "university without walls" is assisting its students to complete their training at a reasonable rate and not making them expend more time and effort than needed in order to collect additional fees? Undoubtedly this is not an exhaustive list of the questions that must be answered in dealing with the issue of accreditation, but it is enough to illustrate the kinds of problems involved.

Another matter, closely related to accreditation, is what kind of recognition will established institutions give to external degrees? Will they accept them as evidence of the qualifications of prospective students to pursue graduate and professional studies? The reaction of traditional institutions to these new methods of earning degrees may have far-reaching significance. Initially it may encourage or discourage acceptance of these degrees by employers and others who have come to depend on colleges and universities to certify the competence of individuals. In the long run, however, the attitude of traditional colleges and universities to these new programs and institutions may determine whether they themselves have a viable future.

Another order of concern raises questions just as perplexing as these. What will be the role of traditional institutions after the changes that are impending have occurred? What will be the purpose of liberal arts colleges like Scripps or Occidental or even the colleges of arts and sciences in larger institutions? And what will be the fate of traditional universities like Stanford, USC, and the campuses of the University of California?

A few conjectures may help us get these matters in perspective. First, since the mass demand for post-secondary education will probably be met by the new institutions and the new degree programs, the proportion of the total number of students seeking admission to the traditional institutions may significantly decline. Let me be clear: I am talking about a relative, not an absolute, number of candidates for admission. I anticipate that our society will become more than ever a society of learners and that the total number of students will therefore continue to increase rapidly in the next decade, especially as the so-called non-traditional students swell the ranks of those enrolled in programs of higher education. As a consequence traditional institutions may receive a smaller percentage of the total body of students but still may have approximately the same enrollments as they now have. Such a development may have a beneficial result, for those who will enter traditional colleges and universities will be more likely to know why they will have chosen that course and may therefore be motivated to work effectively. Secondly, I predict that at the end of the decade traditional colleges and universities will still be enrolling chiefly young people of the conventional college age. It is, however, likely that our institutions will have only thirty per cent rather than fifty per cent of that group. Furthermore a good proportion of them may come to college only after a break of a year or two between high school and college. Yet for those young people who want to go on to graduate and professional schools, including schools of business administration and perhaps some new ones specializing in public policy studies, college attendance at the conventional age to pursue learning in the liberal arts will still be the most convenient and economical way for them to manage their time and energy, to say nothing of their resources. In addition, I am convinced that we shall still have a significant fraction of young people who will seek learning in the liberal and creative arts for its intrinsic value and not just because it is a means to an end. On the other hand, and thirdly, I assume that undergraduate courses will take less time in 1980 than they now do. The Kerr Commission report, *Less Time, More Options,* will only hasten a process that had begun even before it appeared. And finally, though I don't covet the role of a Cassandra, I foresee the possibility that some institutions must either transform themselves in important ways to face the difficult choice of merging with other institutions or going out of existence.

One thing that all of these conjectures taken together signify is that the need for traditional forms of higher education at the end of the seventies will be little if any greater than it is today. What this point means is that development of traditional higher education will in the seventies be far different than it was in the fifties and sixties. As we have dealt with the unprecedented increase in the number of students entering colleges and universities since the Second World War, we have for the most part used only one model in fashioning our burgeoning system of higher education. In founding new institutions and in recasting and enlarging old ones, we have sought to provide for the overwhelming majority of students the educational programs and experiences fostered

in the four-year, residential, liberal arts colleges of the pre-war years. Old normal schools or teachers colleges have almost entirely disappeared as they have undergone a metamorphosis into four-year colleges for general education purposes. Land grant colleges, specializing in agriculture and engineering, have more often than not become universities offering all programs usually found in such institutions and having at their core a four-year undergraduate college of arts and sciences. Even the junior colleges, which have sprung up and flourished everywhere in the last twenty-five years, have as their principal function, though not their only function, the provision of an academic program for students who intend to transfer to four-year institutions. With all these changes we have, without a doubt, improved the overall quality of higher education as we have vastly augmented opportunities for our young people. We have also successfully performed what seemed to be in the fifties a dismayingly immense, if not impossible, task, that of meeting an unprecedented need for persons with graduate degrees.

Excellent as this system is, I am predicting that major efforts to enlarge it will not be required. Nor will such efforts be practicable because of the large outlay of funds they will require. For all its excellence, we have created a high cost system of general higher education — one which is in my estimation impossible to develop much further without overtaxing either the public treasury, faced with a multitude of competing priorities, or the private philanthropic purse. Trial projections of current costs into the future, such as those undertaken by the Carnegie Commission and, for a single state, by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, have predicted annual deficits running into the hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars and lead me to believe that no combination of agencies, public or private, will be able to finance a system of higher education that continues to depend solely on further expansion along the lines followed in the fifties and sixties.

What then can institutions like ours expect in the seventies?

FIRST of all, I would suggest that we can expect to be around all through the seventies and also through the eighties and nineties and into the next century. Although the need and ability to provide additional institutions like ours will probably diminish and perhaps disappear, the need for our existing institutions, or ninety-nine out of a hundred of them, will remain and the funds to support them will be found. In other words, I do not despair of our having a future or of that future being a financially viable one. I only doubt that we can look forward to the possibility or even the desirability of reproducing new institutions patterned on our present ones.

Another prospect lying before us can even be called fair and bright — if we can meet a challenge. It will be fair and bright if we can muster the resources of imagination and intelligence to use ingenuity in distilling virtue from necessity. In a real sense the situation that lies before us offers us the chance to recover powers of self-determination, to cease being as other-directed as we have often been since 1945, and to

become leaders who really set goals for our institutions and academic communities. Indeed we may be able by such means to bring back genuine diversity to a system which, despite its pluralistic nature, has become so uniform as to be almost homogenized.

To indicate what I am driving at I can only suggest questions to which we all need to give hard unfettered thought. I cannot at this moment provide the answers.

From those of us who work within residential colleges and universities, questions like these demand serious consideration: What is the special value of the residential experience to students? Is it a real value or is it illusory? In other words, is residence on campus anything more than a convenience for students and for the institutions they attend? If it is a real value, does our kind of residential situation foster it? If it is not available for everybory, how can we determine which students can most profit from it? Do students need the residential experience throughout their whole college career?

To those of us who are chiefly concerned with undergraduate education in the liberal arts, another set of questions must also be put. Do we really know what it is to be a free person in the last decades of the twentieth century? What special fears, doubts, and misapprehensions on the one side and what special forms of pride, arrogance, and complacency on the other limit freedom in this age? What does it mean, then, to foster liberal learning for persons besent with these difficulties? Are our programs intended to help students formulate standards of judgment and taste for themselves as well as to implant bits of knowledge? Is it our plan to produce well-stocked minds or should we be concerned with helping students become persons who can acquire the knowledge they need and who can use whatever stock of knowledge they have to think purposefully and to act creatively? Can learning in the liberal arts as we present it assist students to become autonomous individuals? Should we continue to plan our educational programs as if the college years were the last chance that students will have for learning? Should we perpetuate practices that influence students to get all their undergraduate education in one uninterrupted period of years, or should we adopt practices that not only permit a few students but encourage many to alternate academic pursuits with experience in the world of affairs? And a closely related question: Do all students need to spend four years in college?

Finally, those of us who are responsible for universities might ponder further questions like these: What characteristics actually distinguish a university from a college? Has advanced training in the arts, sciences, and professions been forced into a straight jacket? It is correct to assume that all serious graduate students are going to become research scholars? Is it possible to produce respect for specialization and the ability to pursue independent inquiry into special fields of study and research without running the risk of narrowing a person's mind and attitudes to the limits of a specialty? Should the university give consideration to helping apprentice specialists learn how to relate their work to that of others? What is the responsibility of the university to other institutions of education? Should graduate and professional schools enroll persons with

external degrees? What responsibility does the university have to society? Should it nurture the social and ethnical sense of graduate and professional students as well as their competence in their chosen field? To what extent should the university provide resources like libraries, museums, and art galleries to other educational institutions and the public at large? Are university programs too time consuming and should they not be planned with the idea that advanced students will still be learners after they receive their degrees?

Although my list of questions is long enough to be boring, it is not exhaustive. Each of you can think of others for yourself. The more such questions force members of an institution to reassess its fundamental nature, purposes, and role the better they will be. Without probing questions, asked in time, colleges and universities will not easily adapt to the changes that are upon us and may be victimized by events.

Before concluding, I have one further suggestion. Although leaders in each college and university should in the months ahead reevaluate the purposes and role of their institution, some master planning can also be helpful both to us educators and to society as a whole. In California, for instance, the master plan for higher education, which is based on a principle of division of functions among institutions, will soon need to be revised if, as I predict, a large proportion of students follow programs leading to external degrees. At the very last, initiation of studies for external degrees will affect future requirements for physical plant, not only for public institutions but also for independent colleges and universities.

Here then is my diagnosis and prognosis for higher education in circumstances of accelerating change that threaten "future shock." All institutions of higher education, both public and private, are in the midst of a financial crisis which is not made but only aggravated by perturbations of the general economy. The American system of higher education is at the same time faced with social demands and needs that have never been greater. Projections of operating plans and of costs into the future confront us with the chilling prospect that expansion of the present system without some fundamental changes may not only be educationally undesirable but financially so costly that neither the tax-payer nor the philanthropist is likely to support it. At this juncture a portent, which two years ago seemed like a summer cloud on the horizon, no bigger than a man's hand, has suddenly begun to assume for different proportions. External degrees and the institutions to provide them are here as realities, and unless I am badly mistaken they will spread like wildfire as they win greater and greater support throughout the seventies. It is urgent, therefore, for us to develop academic plans which give attention to the cost analysis outlined by Howard Bowen at this meeting. But, of even greater importance, we must conscientiously reexamine our purposes and practices, reaffirm those that are good, adopt new ones where necessary, and make diligent use of imagination to find in the midst of these circumstances both academically acceptable and financially feasible ways to achieve them.

Panel I GOVERNING HIGHER EDUCATION

Chairman: DALE W. ANDREWS, *Academic Vice President*
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo

Presenter: HAROLD HODGKINSON, *Project Director*
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education,
University of California, Berkeley

Recorders: DANA HODGSON, Westmont College
KATI PERRY, University of California, Santa Barbara

Dr. Hodgkinson prefaced his remarks by quoting Clark Kerr: "The American University will become a modified quasi-public utility." He then introduced a scale on the effectiveness of administrators and commented upon the complexity of the decision-making process. There are over 162,000 decision-making units in American public education today. The problems resulting from a lack of unit coordination have contributed to the administrative difficulties in which the university now finds itself.

One of the most important changes which has occurred in higher education during the past decade, according to Dr. Hodgkinson, is a dramatic change in inner-governmental structure. The most obvious result of this change is a sharp increase in student authority — an increase which characterizes both private and public institutions.

The demand for change in the governmental structure of the university has affected different campuses in different ways. In order to clarify this phenomenon, Dr. Hodgkinson presented the following breakdown of American colleges:

1. Intellectual-type colleges — Success measured in terms of graduate orientation, length of reading lists, and basic scholarship strength.
2. Vocational institutions.
3. Expressive colleges — Student-oriented, learning via expression.
4. Protective institutions — Have no marked effect upon students; in loco parentis.
5. Collegiate institutions — Making contacts and playing are major goals of student body.

Institutions belonging to one category tend to develop governmental structures similar to others in that category.

Dr. Hodgkinson advanced two theoretical models of institutional governance:

1. Separation of Powers Models — Lay trustees are isolated from all segments of the campus except the president.
2. Unicameral Models.
   A. All segments of the campus are represented on the board of trustees.
   or
   B. Campus senates, which usually have a trustee representative, start out with advisory powers only and rapidly acquire actual power.

Dr. Hodgkinson indicated his firm belief that governance systems must be made more *effective* as well as more *efficient*.

PROPOSITION 1.

Too much attention is focused on decision-making in our writing and thinking about campus governance. Much more needs to be done on the essential relationship between decision-making and implementation. "Accountability" must involve both processes, and the process of accounting should make clear who and what is being accounted to whom. Although decision-making and implementation are processes, we study them as if they were steady-state.

Discussion:

1. The validity of the decision-making process depends on
   A. avoiding unilateral presidential decisions on highly controversial issues;
   B. consulting as many campus segments as possible;
   C. providing the executive with sufficient initiative and authority. (This point is usually recognized by campus senates after about two year of operation. Autonomy is gradually pushed back to local units.)
2. In order to categorize decision-making in terms of competence on the part of students, faculty, and administrators, respectively, to deal with various problems, it was suggested that each campus set up "reasonable criteria" to determine who should decide what.
3. There is a pressing need for exploration of the various facets of decision-making. Such a study should include evaluation of students as resources for governing bodies as opposed to their effectiveness as voting participants. Acquainting students with the organizational structure of the university is educationally important. Every institution should offer a course on itself.
4. There is an unfortunate trend toward making college presidents more and more accountable for decisions in which they play no real part: for example, the recent decision of UC Regents requiring the Chancellors to act as watchdogs over student newspapers. This situation is extremely hard on chief executives and a major factor in the short tenure of college presidents (between three and four years on the average).
5. Latitude and trust are two major features of the ideal administrative system, both conspicuously absent from most American universities today and needed even more as students are included in the administrative decision-making process.

PROPOSITION 2.

The new "campus council" form of unicameral body with faculty, student, and administration representation may not be a brave new system, but rather the last gasp on campus of the principle of representationality. Students are becoming more interested and committed to direct, *ad hoc* styles of participation. They have also grasped the notion that on most campuses the action is at the "top" and "bottom" (the department and trustee

levels) and not in the middle, where the campus council must be. The campus senate or council (and there are at least 300 of them) may be a copout.

Discussion:

1. In an era in which only 10% of students and faculty can be considered activist, 40% observers, and 50% apathetic, the problem of achieving accurate representation in the decision-making process is a grave one.
2. Campuses rarely utilize only one model of governance; more often various combinations of the models are used.
3. Real power is vested mainly in the trustees and in the departments.

PROPOSITION 3.

It is not necessarily true that "flat" organizational structures (few layers of hierarchy) are more democratic than "tall" structures, is if democratic is taken to meant the way people treat each other — which is how John Dewey defines it. Many tall campuses have honest, open communication both up and down, and the esprit level is often very high. Some "flat" campuses, on the other hand, are rife with rumor, full of devious political styles, and in some studies show a very low level of esprit. Democracy can happen in almost any kind of a structure, as long as people trust each other.

Discussion:

1. General education requirements should be decentralized to the level of the individual student acting in conjunction with his faculty advisor. New student-faculty relationships would be among the positive effects of such a change. The Contract System, wherein both students and faculty members are asked to specify their educational intentions for a given period, is a possible form of this principle.
2. An ideal system requires a combination of various aspects of both the "flat" structure and the "tall" or hierarchical system.

PROPOSITION 4.

Institutions will necessarily lose autonomy in the next decade; statewide systems will gain autonomy. As the process becomes more political in form and function, the campus president may become the governor's man, rather than the faculty and student's man. Students may begin demanding a say in decision-making at the statewide level when they come to see how much power and initiative rest there. Other students will stick with the idea that the best way for students to govern is to stay outside of the formal structure and threaten. (It has been remarkably effective so far.)

Discussion:

1. How can a balance be reached between student threat from pressure groups outside the structure, and an attitude of trust, inviting student involvement, within the structure?

A. An attempt should be made to incorporate some outside students into the structure without "co-opting" the outside student forces.
B. As an example, the University of California and California State Colleges have initiated student lobby programs in Sacramento, financed by student funds.

2. Institutional autonomy is decreasing. The concept of the campus as a sanctuary immune from civil law is gradually dying.
3. The faculty in most schools no longer "have a man"; that is, the president is no longer the leading faculty member, but a political figure.

PROPOSITION 5.

> The crucial problem in governing involves developing a dual focus of macro and micro, of quality and quantity, of teaching and research, of reciprocity and autonomy. Thus we must come to see the student *simultaneously* as FTE, as food consumer, as occupier of 1.0 seats in 4.0 classrooms, as intellect, and, perhaps, as soul. (One administrator told me, "Any student who came to this university saying he was searching for the good life would be dispatched to the psychiatric clinic.") The faculty member is not a disembodied intellect, nor is he really an FTE. He is a growing, changing human being who brushes his teeth like the rest of us. Planning (an increasingly essential phase of governance) should be limited to those people who can relate quantitative and qualitative dimensions.

Discussion:

1. The academic curriculum rarely comes out of a process of implementation on the basis of certain institutional goals and objectives. There is, therefore, no close relationship between institutional objectives and course offerings.
2. Decentralization and ad hoc task forces within the structure are necessary for getting work done, such as dealing with localized problems.
3. Quantitative aspects can be worked with more effectively as new methods of measuring both qualitative and quantitative factors are developed.
4. It is necessary to measure educational environments effectively and individually. Greatness must be measured differently for different campuses. Accreditation teams have recognized this point and have taken a personalized approach to each campus.
5. Educational testing can measure administrative, faculty, and student climates and perceptions individually. Since separate measurement scales are used for each segment, discrepancies in attitudes between the groups can be exposed. Over a period of time, coalescence around desired goals can be shown if any progress is taking place.
6. Some students are unable to deal with the discussion of detailed quantitative analysis, but they should be trained, not excluded.

PROPOSITION 6.

> Students and faculty are often assumed to be genetically incapable of learning about financial matters. This is partially

because budgetary information is carefully kept from them. If students and faculty are to participate in decision-making involving money matters (and all decision-making does), then they deserve a comprehensive set of budget facts and the means to interpret them. Similarly, budget officers need to be educated in the academic value system: they too are educable.

Discussion:

1. Is budget information withheld purposely or because of budget complexity? Communication breakdowns between budget personnel and faculty-administration are the result of language differences. Finance personnel speak in budget terms while faculty speak in academic terms. A new interest in the State budget has been observed on some campuses. This may indicate a desire to understand financial matters.
2. Unicameral campus senates have extreme difficulty in dealing with budget matters. The trend for such systems is toward realizing the importance of good budget officers. The senate eventually resigns itself to establishing priorities and allowing budget officers to take over from there.
3. External forces are important in the finalizing of budgets, but a wise input of needs and concerns should be obtained from lower levels before submitting the budget to the outside agency. A unicameral structure will provide wider involvement in the early stages of budget development, thus avoiding problems of frustration with budgets that amount to little more than divine fiat.
4. There is a question whether campus priorities will be implemented financially by those who make budget decisions.
5. Faculty and students want to become involved, but believe that involvement should take no time.
6. Some believe that the president should have a "hip pocket budget" for innovation, but full disclosure of budget matters is usually the best policy. Open disclosure does not lead to immediate consensus in a unicameral type structure, but it is still probably best, particularly on small campuses, as it should be a vital part of the educational process and definitely provides for better budgetary decisions.

PROPOSITION 7.

In all of campus governance, the decision we make worst is that of promoting a faculty member to tenure. It is often based on rumor, gossip, malice, how one holds a teacup at a presidential reception and other irrelevant criteria. If good teaching is a criteria for tenure, then teaching should be assessed, not just by student ratings, but by the faculty member's colleagues who actually watch his teaching. Giving tenure to a 35-year-old teacher is a $750,000 decision, not to mention the deveolpment of some 7,500 minds, yet it is often made in the most casual way imaginable. The matter deserves our best intellects, not our worst. No business could survive this kind of decision-making.

Discussion:

1. False aspirations among assistant professors can be allayed by informing them honestly of their status and future prospects upon hiring. This system tends to sustain a continuous flow of young minds through the institution.
2. Five-year contracts in place of tenure would cause improvement in the quality of teaching.
3. Post-tenure review could be written into the tenure contract, forcing the faculty to think ahead.
4. Due to the functional significance of tenure, however, a reasonable substitute would have to be found if tenure were dropped.
5. Faculty performance can be assessed by the "Tom Sawyer" method, which involves review and critique of video-taped teaching situations.
6. Students can participate in tenure decisions at two levels: (a) as voting members of tenure committees, or (b) by rating faculty. Student opinion does not vary greatly from peer faculty opinion in such decisions. Students are not overly concerned with faculty age, life style, or grading standards when it comes to rating their teaching abilities.

PROPOSITION 8.

Faculty at most large institutions (especially faculty senates) are dominated by the iron law of oligarchy — the Committee on Committees keeps on nominating the same people. Hypothesis: This process is related to "quality" as Parsons and Platt imply, and is a necessary price we pay for the conventional university standard of "excellence."

Discussion:

Because only 20% or less of any faculty are good committee members, the same people are asked again and again. This tends toward an oligarchical system, but good workers are produced. In small institutions, this is not a serious problem, but in larger schools countless good committee members are missed or passed over. The friendship nomination system prevails.

SUMMARY

It is clear that any one neat, clean structure is an impossibility, and that individual experimentation is needed in each institutional situation. Dr. Hodgkinson addressed the need to remain receptive to more radical alternatives than those already suggested. One example is a proposed revision by a local college: Upon registration the student will receive 32 tickets. One must be submitted to the professor of each course entered, and upon satisfactory completion of course work the professor will return one half of the ticket to the student. Students who have collected 32 half tickets will be graduated, and those professors with no half tickets at the end of three years will be fired.

Panel II FUNDING HIGHER EDUCATION

Chairman: HAROLD F. SPENCER, *Vice President, Administrative Affairs,* San Fernando Valley State College

Presenter: HOWARD R. BOWEN, *President,* Claremont University Center

Recorders: JAMES BOBZIEN, Westmont College
TIM KERNAGHAN, Westmont College

PROPOSITIONS:

1. The underlying reality of higher educational finance has been that our colleges and universities collectively require a steadily increasing share of the national products. Relatively more of the national product must be "captured" for higher education year after year because enrollments grow and costs rise. Continued ingenuity and innovation are needed to secure the necessary funds. Is there any end to this process?

2. Enrollment will continue to increase but at a slower rate.

3. Instruction of a quality equal or superior to that now offered could be provided at substantially lower cost per unit through improvements in efficiency and elimination of unnecessary services. However, higher education is expected to take on new and expensive responsibilities and these will more than offset the gains in efficiency.

4. The annual rate of increase in faculty and staff salaries can be slowed down without endangering the flow of high-level talent to the academic profession, but regular increases in wage and salary rates of 3 or 4 per cent a year can be expected.

5. The financing of student aid will no longer be a responsibility of colleges and universities and will be provided wholly by government. Private institutions will benefit from student aid which is adjusted for the difference between private and public tuitions.

6. With all these and other changes, total expenditures of higher educational institutions will nearly double in the decade of the 1970's. Efforts will be made to shift the cost to students in the form of high tuitions financed by long-term credit. These efforts will prove socially undesirable. Eventually the nation will see that higher education must be financed by a workable combination of tuitions, private gifts, and appropriations, with the latter having increasing relative importance.

Future Trends

Regardless of the degree of efficiency that can be achieved, higher education will continue to require an increasingly higher share of the national product. For the years 1958-59 to 1968-69, the cost of higher education soared from $6.2 billion to $20.4 billion, and by the years 1980-81, this figure will likely increase to $39 billion, not including inflation. As educators consider means to effect a more stable percentage figure, they must be able to discern realistically the warranted, justifiable

needs of higher education as distinct from their idle wishes on the one hand and the punitive concerns of legislators on the other.

A major problem for the university in this respect is that it cannot bring in efficiency experts as can large corporations and industries, but it must nonetheless compete with them for quality staffing. The instructional staff alone totaled 604,000 for the year 1968-69, and this figure will need to rise to approximately 864,000 to meet the increasing student enrollment. The enrollment as a percentage of the total population figure for the ages of 18-21 will increase from 52% in 1968-69 to 67% in 1980-81. This increase will have an effect on student-faculty ratio, which will grow slightly from 13.5 to 1 in 1968-69 to 14.5 to 1 in 1980-81. Without considering an inflation factor, faculty salaries will need to increase from an average of $11,595 in 1968-69 to $16,532 in 1980-81 in order for the university to compete on a comparable basis with the major industries. This is an increase of about 3% per year.

Breaking down the total budget for higher education, with few exceptions, gradual rates of increase can be expected for all items. Professional and nonprofessional salaries will increase annually at rates of 3% to 5% respectively. An annual 7% increase will continue for library and equipment costs, but purchased supplies and services and building maintenance costs will remain constant. New programs aimed toward assimilation of minority students, including costs for ethnic study centers, special facilities and recruitment, and programs designed for students with severe problems will continue at a rate of increase of 2% per year. The costs due to a relative increase in graduate, professional, and vocational enrollments will rise at a rate of 1% annually. Construction costs will continue to rise 3% annually, but hopefully a gradual reduction in volume of construction will begin to level off this percentage.

The greatest cost *reduction* will occur as student aid is gradually phased out. Higher education must look to federal and state governments for this funding. Business and industry cannot be expected to increase their involvement in higher education because the only direct return on their financial support is the number of students who accept industrial and business positions in their company after graduation. If governmental aid is exercised, the burden for funding will obviously fall back onto the taxpayer, but considering the benefits which society receives from higher education, it could easily afford to give 2% - 3% of the G.N.P.

There is one danger which must be avoided. Governmental aid would create the very desirable situation in which the student had complete freedom of choice in selecting the particular institution he wished to attend, but these institutions must then avoid the error of high pressure competition. Curriculum cannot be subject to student control. The institution must retain its integrity, and it must not begin catering to the interests of each succeeding student generation.

Efficiency Possibilities. In a study recently completed by Gordon Douglas and Howard Bowen (based upon a liberal arts college of 1200 enrollment), they predict that it is possible to increase the efficiency factor of higher education by 1% a year without impairing the quality of education; in fact, quality could rise.

Taking as a mean a moderately proliferated curriculum in which 335 courses are offered, providing 476 different classes with an average enrollment of 20 and a 'moderate' teaching load for the 100 faculty, the total instructional cost would be $2,280,000, which breaks down to $4,789 per class offered, or $240 per student course enrollment.

One possible route of efficiency with a high leverage variable would be to increase the student body by 600 to 1,800, with no corresponding increase in the number of courses, giving an average class size of 30. This plan would drop the $240 figure to $172; however, it is questionable whether quality education could be maintained by increasing enrollment rather than by pruning in other areas. The study also found a low leverage variable in such alternative courses as intensified classroom utilization, a lower rank distribution of faculty, and a change in course distribution by subjects (for example, English over Physics).

In a Conventional Plan, combining all efficiency possibilities (compressed curriculum, heavy faculty teaching loads, bottom-heavy rank distribution of faculty, intensive classroom utilization, and a less expensive mix of courses), the $240 standard figure would drop to $127. If this stringent course were to be combined with the Ruml Plan (in which one-fourth of all instruction would be concentrated in eight large lecture classes), an absolute minimum figure of $117 could be achieved.

Other alternatives were the Programmed Independent Study Plan (a $225 figure for a moderate program of one-third converted classes), the Bakan Tutorial Plan (a $261 cost in which all courses besides languages, sciences, and studios are tutorial), and Kieffer's Mechanical Aids Plan (at a $277 cost).

An Eclectic Plan combining the best elements of all the above alternatives appears to be the best future route for higher education. In a Standard Eclectic Plan with a moderately proliferated curriculum (35% of instruction conventional, 25% Ruml, 15% Programmed Independent Study, 10% Kieffer, 15% Bakan), the $240 cost per student course enrollment could be decreased to $212. A Minimum Cost Eclectic Plan (combining all the stringent extremes listed above under the Conventional Plan), would drop the cost to $134. Even allowing for the inherent problems in changing the course of a bureaucracy, such as higher education, towards increased efficiency, it is possible to achieve a 1% per year improvement in this area while conceivably delivering a higher quality product.

Panel III EVALUATING HIGHER EDUCATION

Chairman: TOM MACMILLAN, *Director of Institutional Research,* Santa Barbara City College

Presenters: DAVID P. GARDNER, *Vice President-Public Service Programs and University Dean of University Extension,* University of California

JOHN W. SNYDER, *President,* Westmont College

Recorder: KARL F. BORGSTROM, University of California, Santa Barbara

The presenters proposed the following eight points for discussion:

1. Every institution needs a procedure for instant budgetary recording, and access to that record, plus infinitely variable analysis patterns.
2. Institutional research could serve far better in undergirding instructional and counselling strategies, where it is not used, than in financial decision-making where it is, rightly, used.
3. The aim of evaluation, assuming the ability to develop academic goals, is to achieve mass individualism.
4. A largely unusued panoply of test instruments now exists for predicting personality characteristics as well as academic performance, thus enhancing the probability of matching learning styles between teacher and student.
5. While endless debate rages about the actual validity of nearly every individual instrument not solely directed at factual content, almost nothing beyond grade-point prediction has been done with their results.
6. A vast area for future research with patterns of existing instruments is available in using — or refuting — the following generalizations:

a. Time adaptability, correlation, and making distinctions vary with the individual and are culturally neutral indicators; if properly communicated they could be tested and would form an adequate basis for predicting academic performance.
b. All other indicators of attitude, personality variations, data manipulations reflect needs for intervention and learning strategy, not prediction in the sense of posing barriers.
c. Those indicators which violate a pattern in reference to any one individual show the presence of inhibition patterns, not talents; they are essentially negative in their significance.

7. Students possessing similar personality characteristics should be associated together in the learning process and matched with teachers possessing like characteristics.
8. General education requirements should be abandoned in favor of requirements responsive to the learning style and subject preferences of the students.

In summary the presenters alleged that sufficient information technology now exists to permit the individualized treatment of masses of students. With existing instruments, evaluation can proceed beyond the

analysis of grade point average to the development of educational strategies and programs that would ultimately result in more attention to the individual student and to consideration of affective as well as cognitive aspects of the learning process. The result would be a better match between student and teacher characteristics and the development of educational requirements responsive to the learning style and subject preference of the students.

The audience voiced considerable doubt as to the appropriateness of the presenters' proposals to the evaluation of higher education. While it was agreed that students are of major concern in evaluation, some felt that the broader picture involving institutional goals warranted consideration as well. It was suggested that the input and outcome variables of the system, which can be measured within the larger context, be isolated first, followed by consideration of the effects of specific proposals. Others felt that cognitive mastery, which is both accessible and measurable, was the key to developing strategies on achieving objectives more effectively.

In summary, the two positions were based on differing assumptions. The presenters felt that we cannot assume that our present evaluation processes are effective; we must concentrate on the strategies for evaluation themselves. The other position was that results determine what changes must be made to achieve system goals.

The relationship of institutional research to accreditation as a method of institutional evaluation was discussed. Internal evaluation, no matter how sharp and precise, may not be enough; community evaluation of services may be closely related to the drying up of resources. Institutions have different effects on people whereby economic and racial disadvantages can be compensated. It appears that accreditation is moving away from attempts to describe quality and moving toward attempts to measure outputs through the use of evaluative criteria which utilize comprehensive data information systems.

Such evaluation gives more attention to individuals and moves the institution away from the rigidity that has hurt higher education in the community. The personalization of the campus, finding out what the students want, will be reflected in better community attitudes.

Goals for undergraduate education are changing because of the rapid growth of information, combined with a high obsolescence rate, which make current education meaningless in twenty years, at a man's career peak. What graduates must have under these circumstances is the ability to handle information imaginatively for problem solving and continued learning. Another goal is the removal of social inequities through the educational process. The assignment is to take people out of the community and, with the aid of special evaluative applications, devise educational strategies which will prepare them to go back into the community and make a difference. Values must be reinstated in higher education, for it is in the adoption of faculty value models that undergraduate learning occurs. Learning ought to be sought for the love of learning to be permanently adopted as a value. And we must get away from producing graduates who are either scientifically or humanistically

ignorant; this can be achieved through the liberalization of education. Strategies will not come without defining educational goals. The institution must use its authority to implement those goals or, failing to do so, the body politic will assume that responsbiility.

In discussing hypotheses for institutional research, two overall goals were stressed: (1) the disintegration of higher education, which occurred in the sixties, must be put back together in the seventies; and in so doing (2) undergraduate education, which has become of least concern, must now be returned to top priority. These goals will be approached within the framework of the following propositions:

1. Educational objectives are describable; however, they may vary.
2. Institutional success in achieving objectives can be evaluated.
3. There is a relationship between the objectives and the educational expectations of the student in a way that the success of one depends on the success of the other.
4. Assuming that student and institutional objectives are the same, students will differ with respect to their rate of progress, learning styles they prefer, relevancy of the curriculum to their individual objectives, and their motivation and persistence.
5. Differences among students require differentiation of curricula and experiences responsive to those differences.
6. Instruments are available now to obtain a profile of the student body which will indicate the way toward maximizing institutional success.
7. Such instruments are not now employed because faculty interests prevail over students interests.
8. The evaluation of higher education focuses more on the economic, social, and political benefits derived by society, than on the effectiveness of the process designed to match means and ends.
9. Prevailing norms will not sustain higher education in the face of mounting pressures to place the student more at the center of institutional concern than before.
10. As the social purpose of the nation has changed from scientific achievement to new social goals, higher education must change its purpose as well, and this means shifting the focus back to undergraduate education.

Western College Association
Minutes

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEEETING
March 12, 1971
Santa Barbara

Call to order: Mark H. Curtis, President

1. *It was MSC that the Minutes of the last Annual Business Meeting on March 6, 1970, be approved as circulated in the Addresses and Proceedings.*
2. Prior to entertaining a motion on the Constitutional amendments, President Curtis recounted the circumstances leading to the separation of WCA from WASC, officially done in 1962, but implemented fully last year. At its October 1970 meeting, the Executive Committee decided to ask for a Constitutional amendment which would give other senior colleges and universities in surrounding states the opportunity to join WCA as active members. Associate membership from less than baccalaureate degree granting institutions in other accreditation regions has always been possible. The second amendment increases the number of members of the Accrediting Commission to be appointed by WCA.
   It was MSC to amend Article II, Membership, to read as follows:
   "The Western College Association shall be composed of active and associate members:
   (1) Active Members. All non-profit public and private institutions of higher education in Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, which are accredited by regional accrediting agencies as collegiate institutions offering baccalaureate degrees, with or without degrees for graduate work, these degrees representing the completion of four years of college work or its equivalent, are eligible to become active members of this Association. Graduate institutions which are similarly accredited to offer graduate degrees either academic or professional, likewise may become active members of this Association.
   (2) Associate Members. The following organizations and institutions shall be eligible to apply to the Executive Committee for associate membership:
   (a) Regionally accredited baccaulaureate degree-granting institutions which are institutionally organized as proprietary institutions in the aforementioned states.
   (b) Regionally accredited institutions offering less than a baccalaureate degree program in the aforementioned states.
   (c) Organizations and institutions founded and maintained for educational purposes (such as libraries and museums), but which are not engaged in offering formal curricula leading to academic degrees."

It was MSC to amend Article VIII, Standing Committees, to read as follows:

"The Executive Committee shall appoint at least six members of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for staggered terms of three years each, and shall name one of these as chairman of the Commission."

3. President's Report, Mark H. Curtis

President Curtis reported on the actions of the Executive Committee at its meetings on October 30, 1970, and on March 11, 1971:

A. The Executive Committee authorized funds for an amicus curiae brief in the case of Ahmed Senoussi vs. Claremont Graduate School, but the case will end with negotiation and no Association funds have been expended or will be needed.

B. The three previous Executive Secretaries, Charles Fitts, Mitchell Briggs, and Francis Herrick, have been invited to compile an oral history of the Association and to collaborate on the production of a written history of the Association for the 50th anniversary meeting to be held in Claremont in 1974. A budget provision of $2,000 has been allocated for this project.

C. The Executive Secretary was authorized to approve, after consulting with the President, any ad hoc meetings which might be called under the auspices of WCA, as long as there was no cost to the Association and these groups did not speak for the Association until their recommendations had been approved by the Executive Committee.

D. The following schedule for annual meetings has been approved:
1972 — March 16-17. San Jose Hyatt House. "Expanded Access: Problems and Prospects." Mark F. Ferber, Vice President for Student Services at the University of Santa Clara, will serve as program chairman. The University of Santa Clara and San Jose State College are the host institutions.
1973 — Hawaii. Host institution: University of Hawaii
1974 — Claremont. Host institutions: The Claremont Colleges.

4. Report of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, William B. Langsdorf, Chairman. (See page 47)

5. Report of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Kay J. Andersen

Dr. Andersen thanked Donald Walker and Marjorie Downing for their services on the Accrediting Commission and Ivan Hinderaker for his term on the WCA Executive Committee, and welcomed their successors. He also thanked Norman Boyan and Albert Spaulding, both of the University of California, Santa Barbara, for their assistance in planning and producing the 1971 annual meeting, and Mark Ferber for accepting the program committee chairmanship for the 1972 meeting. He expressed confidence in the purposes of WCA and announced his commitment to the further development of the Association, keeping the staff and budget as low as possible.

Dr. Andersen has asked Francis Herrick to be chief historian in writing the history of WCA, which was approved by the Executive

Committee. Dr. Herrick will consult with Mitchell Briggs and Charles Fitts and others in the process.

After Dr. Andersen turned the meeting over to President Curtis for a discussion of financial matters, *it was MSC to approve the financial statement and tentative 1971-72 budget for the Western College Association.* (The budget will be mailed to all member institutions with the Annual Report and Audit this summer.)

Dr. Andersen reminded delegates that a grading study had been approved at the March 1970 meeting and $2,000 was set aside for it. Because at least two significant grading studies were under way at the time, it was decided to wait for these findings before proceeding. After reviewing the study of grading literature by Jonathan Warren, Research Psychologist at the Educational Testing Service in Berkeley, Dr. Andersen proposed to the Executive Committee that Dr. Warren direct the study for WCA during 1971-72. Dr. Andersen then introduced Dr. Warren, who discussed the project according to his prospectus. (See page 52)

It was MSC to appoint Dr. Jonathan Warren to conduct a grading study, with $3,000 allocated to it for 1971-72.

6. Report of the Nominating Committee, Dean E. McHenry, Chairman

Dean McHenry presented the following report on behalf of Ellis E. McCune and Thomas D. Terry, S.J., the other members of the committee, and the slate was unanimously approved:

For three-year terms on the WCA Executive Committee: Milton C. Kloetzel, Academic Vice President, University of Southern California; James H. Meyer, Chancellor, University of California, Davis.

For three-year terms on the Senior Accrediting Commission: John E. Cantelon, Vice Provost, University of Southern California; Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Education, Stanford University.

7. Report of the Committee on Resolutions

In the absence of the chairman, Russell T. Sharpe, the following resolutions were read by John A. Greenlee, and unanimously approved. The third member of the committee was Donald P. Merrifield, S.J.

A. RESOLVED that the members of the Western College Association in annual meeting at Santa Barbara on March 11-12, 1971, do hereby express their deep appreciation:

TO the University of California, Santa Barbara, and Westmont College, the host institutions, for making us feel at home;

TO the Program Committee and its Chairman, Norman Boyan, and the Arrangements Committee and its Chairman, Albert Spaulding, and to the Panel Chairmen and Presenters for planning and carrying out a series of stimulating speeches and panel discussions on the differences between dream and reality in the increasingly complex and bewildering field of higher education; and

To the Executive Secretary, Kay J. Andersen, and Evelyn Thorne for all the work they did behind and in front of the scenes, without which there would have been no meeting.

B. WHEREAS there has been introduced into the California State

Assembly a bill which would provide for the accreditation of California junior colleges by 'a community college commission on accreditation,' an agency of the State of California; and WHEREAS this concept is antithetical to the basic philosophy in force both regionally and nationally governing accreditation of educational institutions, which has received recognition by a number of court decisions;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Western College Association, in annual meeting assembled at Santa Barbara, California, on March 11-12, 1971, do hereby declare that they are opposed to any legislation which would provide for educational institutional accreditation by any agency of municipal, state, or federal government; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of the Association hereby (1) endorse the position paper developed by the Junior and Senior Commissions of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and (2) empower the members of its Executive Committee to take such steps as they may deem necessary at the proper time to oppose such legislation.

C. As the Western College Association members assemble in Annual Meeting at Santa Barbara on March 11-12, 1971, we mark with deep sorrow the death of one of our past presidents, Dr. Robert Burns, President of the University of the Pacific.

Robert Burns devoted his life to the service of higher education and to his fellow men. He transformed a fine college into a prestigious university. He tackled, with imagination and rare creativity, the vexing problems of higher education and found brilliant solutions to many of them.

He served this Association with dedication and devotion, helping to shape its philosophy, policies, and present form.

The University of the Pacific will long stand as a tangible monument to his extraordinary career, but we of the Western College Association will remember him as wise counselor, a buoyant leader, and a good friend, whom we will miss as we gather together as we do today.

We extend to his family and to the University of the Pacific our heartfelt sympathy and condolences.

D. The Western College Association mourns the death of one of its distinguished members, Father Paul Harney, S.J., former Academic Vice President and Chancellor of the University of San Francisco, who died suddenly last fall.

Paul Harney served his Order, higher education, his University, and this Association with great distinction. He held important posts in the Association. As Chairman of the Committee on Accreditation of the State Board of Education, he played a key role in evaluating and accrediting programs of teacher education. He was an articulate and wise counselor to the officers and members of Western College Association and Western Association of Schools and Colleges over many years.

He served on countless accreditation committees and always gave to each a full measure of energy and devotion. He was a man of magnetic personality and warmth and was completely without pretension. We shall miss him.

We, the members of the Association, extend our sincere condolences to his family and relatives and to the University of San Francisco, which he served so long and so well .

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
KAY J. ANDERSEN

WILLIAM B. LANGSDORF
Chairman

Report of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

It has been customary for the Chairman of the Commission which accredits senior colleges and universities to report to the membership of the Western College Association at the annual business meeting. While the Senior Commission, together with the secondary and junior or Community College commissions, are now integral parts of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, rather than of the Western College Association, there continue to be interlocking relationships between the Senior Commission and the Western College Association. The Executive Board of the Western College Association currently appoints the members of the Senior Commission (except those who are ex officio members). The Executive Director of the Senior Commission serves as Executive Secretary of the Western College Association. More importantly, the membership of WASC, which is accredited by the Senior Commission and which has no membership meeting, forms the major part of the membership of the Western College Association. Therefore, this business meeting appears to be a most appropriate place to report the activities of the Senior Commission.

As reported at the 1970 meeting of the Western College Association, the Senior Commission has been expanded in membership to 12 in order to assure representation selected from the Pacific basin institutions, from the specialized institutions, and from the church related colleges. Its financial support has also been stabilized by the establishment of an annual accrediting listing fee which has replaced the fee charged for an accreditation visit. Institutions will no longer be levied the large fee for an accreditation visit, but instead will continue to be charged an annual fee. In addition the membership fee in WCA has been drastically reduced since WCA no longer subsidizes the operating expenses of the Senior Commission.

The membership of the Commission during the current year has included Reed Bunnington, Sims Carter, Mark H. Curtis, Ivan Hinderaker, Richard H. Kosaki, Marjorie Downing, Lloyd D. Luckmann, Sister M. Raymunde McKay, Ralph Prator, Donald E. Walker, Brother Eugene Ward, and W. B. Langsdorf, Chairman.

The Commission held two regular meetings, June 22-23, 1970, and January 18-19, 1971. This year, for the first time, the Commission followed a new practice of limiting its agenda at the midwinter meeting to policy matters and handling institutional accreditation at the spring. There will be exceptions to this limitation on the agenda of the midwinter meeting. Accreditation action will be considered where a delay until June might create a serious institutional problem, e.g., an institution seeking an initial accreditation. In addition, institutional accreditation may

be considered at the midwinter meeting when significant policy issues are involved.

During the past year, the Commission took 55 institutional accrediting actions; 15 institutions were reaccredited:

Art Center College of Design, Los Angeles
California State College, Los Angeles
Chaminade College of Honolulu
Humboldt State College, Arcata
Marymount College. Los Angeles
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
Pacific Christian College, Long Beach
Sacramento State College
Saint Albert's College, Oakland
Saint Mary's College, Moraga
San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge
United States International University,
California Western Campus, San Diego
United States International University,
Elliott Campus, San Diego
United States International University,
Performing Arts Center, San Diego
University of California, Berkeley

One institution, California State College, Bakersfield, was given provisional accreditation; one institution was granted candidacy status — University of Hawaii at Hilo; one institution was granted correspondence status — U.S. International University, Colorado Alpine Campus; and one institution received initial accreditation — Hawaii Loa College.

The Comission during its January meeting directed most of its attention to a review of policy and procedure with the objective of making accreditation more useful and significant. A manual of policy and procedure is being prepared for distribution to member institutions with a request for their reactions before policies are finalized. It is hoped that distribution of the final version can be made by January 1972.

One of the chief concerns of the accrediting commission is the development of ways of being of more service to ongoing institutions.

We propose to institute a continuing accreditation to replace the present fixed term limited to a 5-year maximum. The Commission plans to require very brief annual reports from institutions which would indicate any institutional modification or developments of significance. We will ask each institution to designate some member of its staff to be the continuing liaison person between the institution and Commission.

The proposed policy for reaffirmation of accreditation is as follows:

"Although accreditation and membership in WASC do not expire at a specified time, the Commission recognizes that periodic self-study and on-campus visits are essential for continued progress. The nature and frequency of the self-study and visit will depend on many factors, such as the institution's history of accreditation, development of new degree programs, especially at advanced levels, acquisition of new off-campus units, substantial changes

in enrollment and support level, and conditions brought about by internal or external forces, which may make it difficult if not impossible for the institution to fulfill its mission. With the rapid developments in higher education, each institution normally should expect to undertake a self-evaluation and to be visited every five years, but, as stated, there is considerable flexibility. An institution which is requested to prepare for a limited or full visit in less than five years should not view this decision in punitive terms but as an opportunity to maintain close contact with the Commission and to have access to some of the country's finest consultants. Institutions which continue without a visit or report for longer than five years will, of course, have reason to feel satisfied but should also become even more sensitive to the need for continuous self-appraisal.

Depending on the circumstances, agreement will be reached with the Commission to invite a small team to analyze the particular focus of the self-study. If, on the basis of this visit, other problems appear, the Commission will then request additional information or a comprehensive self-study and send in a larger team to conduct a more thorough appraisal of the entire campus. The Commission hopes to use this procedure on a trial basis with a few institutions scheduled for visit in 1971-72."

Of continuing and major concern to the Commission is the need to encourage creative development and the exploration of new concepts in higher education. The Commission will expect, however, that institutions will establish means for evaluating creative undertakings.

As I am sure all here are aware, accreditation, like higher education itself, has become the subject of increasing criticism and challenge. Major issues and problems result from the lack of common standards throughout the nation, the increasing danger of federal or state interference, variances in due process, the increasing number of court suits, and problems of the relationship between regional accreditation and accreditation by the special agencies, the latter being coordinated by the National Commission on Accrediting.

The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions for Higher Education serves as the coordinating body for our six regional agencies which cover the United States. Because of increasing problems, and challenges to accreditation, this federation two years ago authorized a study to review and recommend on all aspects of institutional accreditation. The result was the "Puffer Report" which was distributed several months ago to all accredited institutions of higher education. It recommended that there be a new national organization to replace FRACHE, one which would have centralized authority. The Council of FRACHE, meeting in October, 1970, recommended that instead of a new national organization, FRACHE be reorganized and be given power to set standards, require acceptable performance by the several regions, devise appropriate due process procedures, consider (and probably revamp) the size of the regions, and provide for direct representation of the public. The Council requested that Dr. Puffer summarize the recommendations

and their justification. This statement was sent to all regionally accredited institutions of higher education. It was hoped that recommendations for a strong FRACHE might be approved by the regional commissions by the time of the April 1971 FRACHE meeting.

The first reaction from the senior and junior commissions of WASC has not been very favorable. There is grassroots opposition to the centralization of authority envisioned. If the proposal is to secure approval, it obviously needs further exploration and understanding both by the institutions themselves and by the Commissions as to the necessity for such centralization and the lack of viable alternatives. A joint meeting of ad hoc committees, representing the junior and senior commissions of WASC and the two commissions of Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, met March 10 and recommended modification of the Puffer summary to eliminate mandatory control by FRACHE.

Another development of major significance to all of us here is the emergence of the Far West Council on Accrediting. It has long been recognized that our Western Association, which is composed virtually of two states, has major disadvantages because of its limited area. The Northwest Association is also at a disadvantage because, while its geographic area is wider — including seven states —, it has far fewer member institutions than does WASC. For several years there has been an increasingly close relationship between the Western Association and the Northwest Association. Insofar as the senior institutions and also the community colleges of both regions are concerned, it would be of great benefit were they to be combined into one. Less clear would be the benefit to the secondary institutions in the several states. For the past three years the three commissions of the Western Association, and the two commissions of the Northwest Association have been meeting together annually and have been developing close working relationships. This has taken several forms: for example, an interchange of membership on visiting committees. At the January 1970 meeting of the Far West Council, the chairman of your Senior Commission was elected president of the Far West Council, and James Bemis, Executive Director of the Northwest Association was elected secretary. We were reelected at the meeting of January 1971.

In the Far West Council discussions of January 1970, the five commissions represented did not appear to be in entire agreement on a merger which would transfer authority from the two present associations to a new unified one. However, the Council did direct that a proposal be drafted which would move part-way, probably by keeping the present commissions and associations, and having their accrediting actions validated by the new, broader association. It was hoped that this would give the strength of a wide base, which appears urgently required in the light of the present political and educational scene.

Dr. Hector Lee of our Association, prepared a statement of principles which was approved during 1970 by the five commissions and by the boards of both WASC and the Northwest Association.

The Far West Council, at its meeting in January 1971, reviewed this development and approved a draft constitution which would implemen

the merger. The purpose is to promote the welfare, interests, and further development of secondary and higher education through:

(a) The continued improvement of educational programs both public and private.
(b) The strengthening of cooperative and coordinating efforts and activities of the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and their several accrediting commissions.
(c) The endorsement and support of the accrediting actions of these association and their commissions.

This draft is to be submitted to the respective commissions and the two associations, and, hopefully, will be implemented by next January. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges would continue to exist, as would our Senior Commission. The most important feature of the proposal would be the substitution of a single published Far West Accreditation list for the lists previously published separately by the two associations, and the endorsement by FWCA of the accrediting actions of the five commissions and two associations.

In the absence of a strong national organization for the accrediting of institutions, the proposed merger of the Northwest and Western Associations appears to be an essential immediate alternative. We will keep the membership of the Western College Association and of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges advised of further developments aimed at strengthening and improving accreditation.

The Senior Commission will take final burget action at its June meeting. The major increase for 1971-72 is in Team Travel, to facilitate the inclusion of visiting committees of a representative from the Northwest, and of members from parts of the Western Association not in close proximity to the institution visited. The final budget will be sent with the Annual Report this summer.

JONATHAN R. WARREN
Research Psychologist
Educational Testing Service

Proposal for a Study to Identify the Nature and Variability of Standards of Academic Performance

The proposal outlined below is offered as a starting point from which a study of the certification of academic performance through the assignment of grades might be developed. Should such a study be undertaken, a steering committee representing the Western College Association is considered desirable to ensure that the study pursues a purpose of value to the WCA membership and that later decisions about details of its conduct do not mitigate its usefulness. Accordingly, everything in the proposal is subject to the possibility of change or abandonment.

Purpose

One of the commonly stated functions of grades is to serve as a device for monitoring and maintaining acceptable standards of academic performance in the students a college certifies as having successfully completed a program of instruction. The effectiveness of grades in maintaining academic standards is difficult to assess, however, in view of the diversity in kinds and levels of performance represented by grades given in different courses by instructors differing in their instructional philosophies.

The study outlined below would result in the specification of various dimensions of student performance considered important in different disciplines, at both the upper — and lower — division levels, in different colleges. Making the kinds of performance expected of students explicit, in all the diversity that quite properly exists, should help faculty members, individually and as members of departments, specify their own instructional goals and design procedures in accordance with those goals for evaluating student performance and their own teaching effectiveness. Grading procedures could then be evaluated realistically with respect to their role in maintaining a set of specifiable academic standards.

Procedures

The basic data will be collected by asking the instructors of a selected set of classes to describe in as much detail as possible how a particularly capable student, an ordinary student, and a poor student in the specified class differ with respect to performance in that class. In a single institution, 24 classes will be selected randomly — 8 each in the humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences, and 12 each in the upper and lower divisions. The participation of 10 colleges will provide a set of descriptions from 240 faculty members, enough to expect reasonably representative results without unreasonable burdens on individual faculty members. Forty sets of descriptions will be available at each level in each academic area, each group of 40 being analyzed separately to indicate variation across levels and areas. With only 4 sets of descriptions

at each level and area in each college, colleges that appear similar in the descriptions provided will be grouped and variation will be indicated across groups of colleges.

Specification of the dimensions of performance indicated by 40 diverse descriptions of the ways three students differ will be the primary task of analysis. This will be accomplished by a subjective content analysis starting with a listing of all the descriptive phrases that appear in each group of 40 descriptions. A small number of faculty members will be asked to identify the concept underlying each descriptive phrase. This association of each specific phrase with an underlying concept will permit clerical personnel to count the frequency with which various concepts or dimensions of performance are used to distinguish different levels of academic performance.

The major results of the study will be (1) specification of those concepts most often considered pertinent to academic performance and (2) indication of the extent of their variation across academic areas, levels of instruction, and colleges. If the data are collected toward the end of the spring term of 1971, the study should be completed by the end of August, 1971, at a total cost of approximately $3,000.

The results of this ground-laying study should make possible one or more studies directed to the following sequence of questions.

1. How well are various dimensions of student performance represented in the evaluation procedures of different courses?
2. Which dimensions of student performance are essential to certification that a student has reached an acceptable level of capability? Which are desirable but not essential?
3. How well do different grading procedures and the management of grade records serve the certification function?
4. How might different functions of a certification process be served by different grading procedures?

Officers and Committees

Officers and Executive Committee, 1971-1972

PRESIDENT: *Mark E. Curtis, Scripps College*
VICE PRESIDENT: Dean E. McHenry, *University of California, Santa Cruz*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Kay J. Andersen

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: The above-named officers and Mitchell P. Briggs (Honorary); Harlan Cleveland, *University of Hawaii;* Charles T. Fitts (Honorary); Milton C. Kloetzel, *University of Southern California;* William B. Langsdorf, *California State Colleges;* Ellis E. McCune, *California State College, Hayward;* James H. Meyer, *University of California, Davis;* Russell T. Sharpe, *Golden Gate College;* Very Reverend Thomas D. Terry, S.J., *University of Santa Clara.*

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, WASC: Chairman, William B. Langsdorf, *California State Colleges;* Reed Buffington, *Chabot College;* John E. Cantelon, *University of Southern California;* Sims Carter, *Art Center College of Design;* Mark H. Curtis, *Scripps College;* Ivan Hinderaker, *University of California, Riverside;* Richard H. Kosaki, *University of Hawaii;* Lloyd D. Luckmann, *University of San Francisco;* Lewis B. Mayhew, *Stanford University;* Sister M. Raymunde McKay, *Marymount College;* Ralph Prator, *San Fernando Valley State College;* Brother Eugene Ward, *Archdiocese of San Francisco;* Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director.

Committees of the Association

1970 COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM: Norman J. Boyan, Chairman, *University of California, Santa Barbara;* Dale W. Andrews, *California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo;* David W. Cook, *California State Polytechnic College;* Glenn G. Gooder, *Santa Barbara City College;* David P. Gardner, *University of California;* John W. Snyder, *Westmont College;* Harold F. Spencer, *San Fernando Valley State College;* Kay J. Andersen, *Western College Association.*

1970 COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS: Albert C. Spaulding, *University of California, Santa Barbara.*

Representatives of the Association

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES, WASC: Richard H. Kosaki, *University of Hawaii;* Ralph Prator, *San Fernando Valley State College.*

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS, WASC: Sister M. Raymunde McKay, *Marymont College.*

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: Mark H. Curtis, *Scripps College.*

Officers and Executive Committee 1970-71

PRESIDENT: Mark H. Curtis, *Scripps College*
VICE PRESIDENT: Dean E. McHenry, *University of California, Santa Cruz*
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Kay J. Andersen

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: The above-named officers and Mitchell P. Briggs (Honorary); Harlan Cleveland, *University of Hawaii;* Charles T. Fitts (Honorary); Ivan Hinderaker, *University of California, Riverside;* Milton C. Kloetzel, *University of Southern California;* William B. Langsdorf, *California State Colleges;* Ellis E. McCune, *California State College, Hayward;* Russell T. Sharpe, *Golden Gate College;* Very Reverend Thomas D. Terry, S.J., *University of Santa Clara.*

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, WASC: Chairman, William B. Langsdorf, *California State Colleges;* Vice Chairman, Marjorie Downing, *Scripps College;* Reed Buffington, *Chabot College;* Sims Carter, *Art Center College of Design;* Mark H. Curtis, *Scripps College;* Ivan Hinderaker, *University of California, Riverside;* Richard H. Kosaki, *University of Hawaii;* Lloyd D. Luckmann, *University of San Francisco;* Sister M. Raymunde McKay, *Marymount College;* Ralph Prator, *San Fernando Valley State College;* Donald E. Walker, *San Diego State College;* Brother Eugene Ward, *Archdiocese of Los Angeles;* Executive Secretary, Kay J. Andersen; Administrative Assistant, Hector H. Lee.

Past Presidents of the Association

Director E. C. Moore, *Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles* . 1924-1925-1926
President J. A. Blaisdell, *Claremont College* 1927
President W. F. Dexter, *Whittier College* 1928
Dean T. G. Burt, *Occidental College* 1929
President C. K. Edmunds, *Pomona College* 1930
President V. L. Duke, *University of Redlands* 1931
Dr. E. R. Hedrick, *Univ. of California at Los Angeles* . . 1931-1932
President R. B. von KleinSmid, *Univ. Southern California* . 1932-1933
President R. D. Bird, *Occidental College* 1933-1934
President E. J. Jaqua, *Scripps College* 1934-1935

President H. M. Duce, *Loyola University of Los Angeles*	1935-1936
President E. M. Studebaker, *La Verne College*	1936-1937
President W. O. Mendenhall, *Whittier College*	1937-1938
Dr. W. B. Munro, *California Institute of Technology*	1938-1939
President Russell M. Story, *Claremont Colleges*	1939-1940
President E. J. Anderson, *University of Redlands*	1940-1941
Vice-President Robert G. Cleland, *Occidental College*	1941-1942
President Robert G. Sproul, *University of California*	1942-1943
President E. Wilson Lyon, *Pomona College*	1943-1944
Dean A. S. Raubenheimer, *Univ. of Southern California*	1944-1945
Dean John W. Dodds, *Stanford University*	1945-1946
President Arthur G. Coons, *Occidental College*	1946-1947
President Lynn T. White, jr., *Mills College*	1947-1948
President Frederick Hard, *Scripps College*	1948-1949
Vice-Pres. Emeritus Monroe E. Deutsch, *Univ. of Calif.*	1949-1950
President Lee A. DuBridge, *Calif. Institute of Technology*	1950-1951
President J. Paul Leonard, *San Francisco State College*	1951-1952
President Fred D. Fagg, Jr., *Univ. of Southern California*	1952-1953
President J. E. Wallace Sterling, *Stanford University*	1953-1954
President George H. Armacost, *University of Redlands*	1954-1955
President Herman J. Hauck, S.J., *University of Santa Clara*	1955-1956
President Malcolm A. Love, *San Diego State College*	1956-1957
President Robert E. Burns, *College of the Pacific*	1957-1958
President Paul S. Smith, *Whittier College*	1958-1959
President Arnold E. Joyal, *Fresno State College*	1959-1960
President George C. S. Benson, *Claremont Men's College*	1960-1962
President Guy A. West, *Sacramento State College*	1962-1964
President Charles S. Casassa, S.J., *Loyola Univ., Los Angeles*	1964-1966
Dean Franklin P. Rolfe, *University of California,* Los Angeles	1966-1968
President Frederic W. Ness, *Fresno State College*	1968-1969
President Louis T. Benezet, *Claremont Univ. Center*	1969-1970
President Mark H. Curtis, *Scripps College*	1970-

1972 Meeting
San Jose State College
University of Santa Clara
San Jose Hyatt House
March 15-16, 1972

Western College Association

(*Note:* The active membership of the Association consists of the baccalaureate and graduate collegiate institutions accredited by the Western College Association and/or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and which are organized as non-profit institutions.)

Institution	*Location*	*Administrator*
Art Center College of Design	Los Angeles 90005	Don Kubly
Azusa Pacific College	Azusa 91702	Cornelius P. Haggard
Bethany Bible College	Santa Cruz 95060	Cordas C. Burnett
Biola College	La Mirada 90638	J. Richard Chase
Brooks Institute	Santa Babara 93103	Ernest H. Brooks II
California Baptist College	Riverside 92504	James R. Staples
California College of Arts and Crafts	Oakland 94618	Harry X. Ford
California College of Podiatric Medicine	San Francisco 94115	Higgins D. Bailey
California Institute of the Arts	Burbank 91504	Robert W. Corrigan
California Institute of Technology	Pasadena 91109	Harold Brown
California Lutheran College	Thousand Oaks 91360	Raymond M. Olson
California State College, Bakersfield	Bakersfield 93309	Paul F. Romberg
California State College, Dominguez Hills	Dominguez Hills 90247	Leo F. Cain
California State College, Fullerton	Fullerton 92631	L. Donald Shields
California State College, Hayward	Hayward 94542	Ellis E. McCune
California State College, Long Beach	Long Beach 90801	Stephen Horn
California State College, Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90032	John A. Greenlee
California State College, San Bernardino	San Bernardino 92407	John M. Pfau
California State Polytechnic College, Kellogg-Voorhis	Pomona 91768	Robert C. Kramer
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo 93401	Robert E. Kennedy
Chaminade College of Honolulu	Honolulu 96816	Brother Robert C. Maguire, S.M.
Chapman College	Orange 92666	Donald C. Kleckner
Chico State College	Chico 95926	Stanford Cazier
Church College of Hawaii	Laie, Hawaii 96762	Stephen L. Brower
Claremont Men's College	Claremont 91711	Jack L. Stark
Claremont Graduate School	Claremont 91711	Barnaby S. Keeney
College of the Holy Names	Oakland 94619	Sister Mary Ambrose Devereux
College of Notre Dame	Belmont 94002	Sister Catharine Julie Cunningham
Dominican College of San Rafael	San Rafael 94901	Sister Mary Samuel Conlan
Fresno State College	Fresno 93710	Norman A. Baxter
Fuller Theological Seminary	Pasadena 91101	David A. Hubbard
Golden Gate College	San Francisco 94105	Otto Butz
Graduate Theological Union	Berkeley 94709	John Dillenberger
Harvey Mudd College	Claremont 91711	Joseph B. Platt
Hebrew Union College	Los Angeles 90046	Lewis M. Barth
Humboldt State College	Arcata 95521	Cornelius H. Siemens
Immaculate Heart College	Los Angeles 90027	Sister Helen Kelley
La Verne College	La Verne 91750	Leland B. Newcomer
Loma Linda University	Loma Linda 92505	David J. Bieber
Lone Mountain College	San Francisco 94118	Sister Gertrude Patch
Los Angeles College of Optometry	Los Angeles 90007	Charles A. Abel
Loyola University of Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90045	Donald P. Merrifield, S.J.
Marymount College at Loyola University	Los Angeles 90045	Sister M. Raymunde McKay
Menlo College School of Business Administration	Menlo Park 94025	Richard F. O'Brien
Mills College	Oakland 94613	Robert J. Wert
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies	Monterey 93940	Fulton Freeman
Mount St. Mary's College	Los Angeles 90049	Sister Cecilia Louise Moore
Naval Postgraduate School	Monterey 93940	Alexander S. Goodfellow
Northrop Institute of Technology	Inglewood 90306	Homer H. Grant, Jr.
Occidental College	Los Angeles 90041	Richard C. Gilman

Otis Art Institute of Los Angeles County	Los Angeles 90057	Andreas S. Andersen
Pacific Christian College	Long Beach 90804	Medford H. Jones
Pacific College	Fresno 93702	Arthur J. Wiebe
Pacific Oaks College	Pasadena 91105	E. Robert LaCrosse, Jr.
Pacific Union College	Angwin 94508	F. O. Rittenhouse
Pasadena College	Pasadena 91104	W. Shelburne Brown
Pepperdine College	Los Angeles 90044	Wm. S. Banowsky
Pitzer College	Claremont 91711	Robert H. Atwell
Pomona College	Claremont 91711	David Alexander
Russell College	Burlingame 94010	Raymond N. Doyle
Sacramento State College	Sacramento 95819	Bernard L. Hyink
Saint Albert's College	Oakland 94618	Janko Zagar, O.P.
Saint John's College	Camarillo 93010	W. Theo. Wiesner, C.M.
Saint Mary's College	St. Mary's College 94575	Br. Mel Anderson, F.S.C.
Saint Patrick's College	Mountain View 94040	Edwin F. Schmitz, S.S.
San Diego College for Women	San Diego 92110	Sister Nancy Morris
San Diego State College	San Diego 92115	Malcolm A. Love
San Fernando Valley State College	Northridge 91324	James W. Cleary
San Francisco Art Institute	San Francisco 94133	Fred Martin
San Francisco Conservatory of Music	San Francisco 94122	Milton Salkind
San Francisco State College	San Francisco 94132	S. I. Hayakawa
San Jose State College	San Jose 95114	John H. Bunzel
Scripps College	Claremont 91711	Mark H. Curtis
Simpson College	San Francisco 94134	Mark W. Lee
Sonoma State College	Rohnert Park 94928	Thomas H. McGrath
Southern California College	Costa Mesa 92626	Emil A. Balliet
Stanford University	Stanford 94305	Richard W. Lyman
Stanislaus State College	Turlock 95380	Carl Gatlin
United States International University		William C. Rust
California Western Campus	San Diego 92106	
Elliott Campus	San Diego 92128	
Performing Arts Center	San Diego 92101	
University of California, Berkeley	Berkeley 94720	Roger W. Heyns
University of California, Davis	Davis 95616	James H. Meyer
University of California, Irvine	Irvine 92650	Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr.
University of California, Los Angeles	Los Angeles 90024	Charles E. Young
University of California, Riverside	Riverside 92502	Ivan Hinderaker
University of California, San Diego	La Jolla 92037	Herbert F. York
University of California, Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara 93106	Vernon I. Cheadle
University of California, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz 95066	Dean E. McHenry
University of Guam	Agana, Guam 96910	Pedro Sanchez
University of Hawaii	Honolulu 96822	Harlan Cleveland
University of Judaism	Los Angeles 90028	David Leo Lieber
University of the Pacific	Stockton 95204	AlistairW.McCrone
University of Redlands	Redlands 92374	Eugene F. Dawson
University of San Diego, College for Men	San Diego 92110	John E. Baer, S.T.D.
University of San Francisco	San Francisco 94117	Albert R. Jonsen, S.J.
University of Santa Clara	Santa Clara 95053	Thomas D. Terry, S.J.
University of Southern California	Los Angeles 90007	John R. Hubbard
West Coast University	Los Angeles 90005	Victor Elconin
Westmont College	Santa Barbara 93103	----------
Whittier College	Whittier 90608	Frederick S. Binder

Associate Membership List

(*Note:* The Association has the following categories of associate members: 1) Accredited senior proprietary institutions; 2) Institutions accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Junior Colleges, WASC; 3) Institutions of like character to those accredited as active members but which are accredited by other regional associations; and 4) Organizations and institutions founded for educational purposes — such as museums and research libraries — but not directly engaged in offering curricula.)

Accredited Senior Proprietary Institutions

Institution	*Location*	*Administrator*
Armstrong College	Berkeley 94704	John E. Armstrong
Woodbury College	Los Angeles 90017	Dora E. Kirby

Associate Members *(continued)*

Accredited Junior Colleges

(*Note:* Not all accredited junior colleges have elected to accept associate membership in WCA.)

Institution	*Location*	*Administrator*
Allan Hancock College	Santa Maria 93454	Walter E. Conrad
Bakersfield College	Bakersfield 93305	Burns L. Finlinson
Barstow College	Barstow 92311	Donald L. White
Cabrillo College	Aptos 95003	Robert E. Swenson
California College of Mortuary Science	Los Angeles 90033	Melvin D. Hilgenfeld
California Concordia College	Oakland 94605	William Poehler
Center for Early Education	Los Angeles 90048	Mrs. Wayne Holmen
Chabot College	Hayward 94545	Reed L. Buffington
Chaffey College	Alta Loma 91701	T. Stanley Warburton
Citrus College	Azusa 91702	Robert D. Haugh
City College of San Francisco	San Francisco 94112	Louis F. Batmale
College of the Desert	Palm Desert 92260	Roy C. McCall
College of the Redwoods	Eureka 95501	Eugene J. Portugal
College of the Sequoias	Visalia 93277	Ivan C. Crookshanks
Compton College	Compton 90221	Abel B. Sykes, Jr.
Contra Costa College	San Pablo 94806	Robert L. Wynne
Deep Springs College	Deep Springs via Dyer, Nevada 89010	Randall Reid
Diablo Valley College	Pleasant Hill 94523	William P. Niland
East Los Angeles College	Los Angeles 90022	John K. Wells
Foothill College	Los Altos Hills 94022	Hubert H. Semans
Fresno City College	Fresno 93704	Clyde C. McCully
Gavilan College	Gilroy 95020	Ralph Schroder
Glendale College	Glendale 91208	John T. McCuen
Grossmont College	El Cajon 92020	Erv F. Metzgar
Hartnell College	Salinas 93901	Gibb Madsen
Laney College	Oakland 94606	Herbert M. Stein
Long Beach City College	Long Beach 90808	Wiley D. Garner
Los Angeles City College	Los Angeles 90029	Louis Kaufman
Los Angeles Harbor College	Wilmington 90744	Wendell C. Black
Los Angeles Pierce College	Woodland Hills 91364	John R. Nicklin
Merced College	Merced 95340	Lowell F. Barker
Merritt College	Oakland 94609	Norvel Smith
MiraCosta College	Oceanside 92054	John MacDonald
Napa College	Napa 94558	George W. Clark
Ohlone College	Fremont 94537	Stephen E. Epler
Orange Coast College	Costa Mesa 92626	Robert B. Moore
Palomar College	San Marcos 92069	Frederick R. Huber
Palo Verde College	Blythe 92225	David L. Brown
Pasadena City College	Pasadena 91106	Armen Sarafian
Porterville College	Porterville 93257	Orlin H. Shires
Rio Hondo Junior College	Whittier 90608	Walter M. Garcia
San Benardino Valley College	San Bernardino 92403	Arthur M. Jensen
San Diego City College	San Diego 92101	Sheridan Rex Garton
San Diego Mesa College	San Diego 92111	Ellis M. Benson
San Francisco College of Mortuary Science	San Francisco 94109	Dale W. Sly
San Joaquin Delta College	Stockton 95204	Joseph L. Blanchard
Santa Ana College	Santa Ana 92706	John E. Johnson
Santa Barbara City College	Santa Barbara 93105	Glenn G. Gooder
Santa Monica City College	Santa Monica 90406	Wade F. Thomas
Santa Rosa Junior College	Santa Rosa 95401	C. Brook Tauzer
Shasta College	Redding 96001	Gilbert A. Collyer
Sierra College	Rocklin 95677	Harold M. Weaver
Taft College	Taft 93268	Garlyn A. Basham
Victor Valley College	Victorville 92392	Burton W. Wadsworth
West Valley College	Campbell 95008	James P. Hardy
Yuba College	Marysville 95901	Daniel G. Walker

Other Institutions

Institution	*Location*	*Administrator*
American College Testing Program	Iowa City, Iowa 52240	Fred F. Harcleroad
Thunderbird Graduate School of International Management	Phoenix, Arizona 85001	Robert F. Delaney
Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities	Los Angeles 90017	Morgan Odell
California State Department of Education	Sacramento 95814	Wilson Riles
California State Scholarship and Loan Commission	Sacramento 95814	Arthur S. Marmaduke
College Student Personnel Institute	Claremont 91711	John L. Cowan
Defense Language Institute, West Coast Branch	Monterey 93940	Kibbey M. Horne
Educational Testing Service	Berkeley, Calif. 94704	John S. Helmick
*University of Arizona	Tucson, Arizona 85721	Richard A. Harvill
**University of Nevada	Reno, Nevada 89507	N. Edd Miller

*Accredited by North Central Association

**Accredited by Northwest Association

Western College Association
Constitution and By-Laws

As Amended March 12, 1971

ARTICLE I. Name and Purpose

This organization shall be entitled WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION. Its purpose is to promote the welfare, interests, and development of higher education in the region which this Association undertakes to serve.

ARTICLE II. Membership

The Western College Association shall be composed of active and associate members:

(1) *Active Members.* All non-profit public and private institutions of higher education in Alaska, Arizona, California, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, which are accredited by regional accrediting agencies as collegiate institutions offering baccalaureate degrees, with or without degrees for graduate work, these degrees representing the completion of four years of college work or its equivalent, are eligible to become active members of this Association. Graduate institutions which are similarly accredited to offer graduate degrees either academic or professional, likewise may become active members of this Association.

(2) *Associate Members.* The following organizations and institutions shall be eligible to apply to the Executive Committee for associate membership:

(a) Regionally accredited baccalaureate degree-granting institutions which are institutionally organized as proprietary institutions in the aforementioned states.

(b) Regionally accredited institutions offering less than a baccalaureate degree program in the aforementioned states.

(c) Organizations and institutions founded and maintained for educational purposes (such as libraries and museums), but which are not engaged in offering formal curricula leading to academic degrees.

ARTICLE III. Officers

The officers of the Association shall be a president, a vice-president, and an executive secretary-treasurer.

The president and vice-president shall be elected at the regular Annual Meeting of the Association for a two-year term. A plurality shall be sufficient for election. The executive secretary-treasurer shall be appointed by the president with the consent of the Executive Committee.

The duties of the above officers shall be those which usually pertain to their several offices. The president shall be an *ex-officio* member of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of WASC.

The offices of president, vice-president, and executive secretary-treasurer shall be filled only by representatives of the active members of the Association.

ARTICLE IV. Meetings

There shall be one regular meeting annually in the spring. Other meetings may be called at any time by the president of the Executive Committee. A representation of one-third of the active members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. A smaller number may adjourn to a particular day.

ARTICLE V. Voting

Prior to each meeting of the Association each active member shall be requested to designate an official voting representative, who shall act as the accredited delegate of that institution for the purpose of voting on critical issues which may be expected to arise at the meeting of the Association.

Each active member shall be entitled to one accredited delegate.

Where critical questions are at issue only the authorized delegate of each institution, or his duly appointed alternate, shall be qualified to vote.

The presiding officer shall be required to put any question to a vote by the authorized delegates, if any accredited delegate requests the presiding officer to put such a vote.

It is understood that the presiding officer himself would always have the authority to ask for such a vote.

In the ordinary conduct of business the usual method of *viva voce* voting shall be employed.

ARTICLE VI. Amendments

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of accredited delegates at any regular meeting, one month previous notice having been given to all active members of the Association.

ARTICLE VII. Standing Committees

(1) *Executive Committee.* The Executive Committee shall consist of the president, vice-president, immediate past-president, executive secretary-treasurer, the Chairman of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and six members elected by the active membership of the Association for staggered terms of three years each. Two new members shall be elected each year at the Annual Meeting and shall come only from the active members of the Association. A plurality shall be sufficient for election. A member who has served a three-year term may not be re-elected for a period of one year.

Six members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

The Executive Committee in any fiscal year shall have the power to assess members up to fifty per cent of their annual membership dues to provide for emergency expenses of the Association. The Executive Committee shall appoint at least six members of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for staggered

terms of three years each, and shall name one of these as chairman of the Commission.

The Executive Committee shall submit a summary report of its actions at each regular meeting of the Association.

(2) *Committee on Research and Special Studies.* A committee of six members appointed by the president and the Executive Committee shall be responsible for initiating and stimulating research on problems of education and, when authorized by the Executive Committee, for undertaking or sponsoring special studies.

ARTICLE VIII. Representatives

Of the three representatives of the Association on the American Council on Education, one shall be appointed by the president and Executive Committee for a period of five years. He shall be a person who presumably can attend the meetings of the American Council on Education with regularity during his term of office. The other two representatives shall be appointed annually by the president and the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE IX. Dissolution or Liquidation

No part of any income, revenue, and grant of or to the Association shall inure to the material or pecuniary benefit of any member, officer, or any private individual (except that reasonable compensation may be paid for services rendered in connection with one or more of its services), and no member, officer, or any private individual shall be entitled to share in the distribution of any of the assets of the Association on its dissolution or liquidation. In the event of such dissolution or liquidation the Executive Committee of the Association will transfer to one or more tax-exempt educational organizations the net assets of the Association.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I. Dues

The annual dues of active members, payable as of July 1st, are as follows:

Full-time equivalent enrollment from 1 to 1,000 students	$100.00
Full-time equivalent enrollment from 1,001 students upwards	$150.00

The annual dues for all associate members, payable as of July 1st, are $25.00.

ARTICLE II. Conduct of Business

All meetings of this Association shall be conducted under *Robert's Rules of Order, Revised.*